THE VALIDITY OF THE ORDERS OF THE Church of England,

Made out against the Objections of the Papists, in several Letters to a Gentleman of *Norwich*, that desired Satisfaction therein.

By *Humphrey Prideaux*, D. D. Prebendary of *Norwich*.

LONDON,

Printed by *John Richardson* for *Brabazon Aylmer* at the three *Pidgeons* in *Cornhil*, over-against the *Royal Exchange*, 1688.

Imprimatur,

Hic Liber cui Titulis (*Certain Papers*, &c.) June 8. 1688.

Jo. Battely.

TO THE
READER.

THeſe Letters when firſt Written, were never deſigned for the Publick, but only to endeavour the ſatisfaction of one particular Perſon, who applyed to me for it, one *Mr.* Anthony Norris, late a Juſtice of Peace for the County of Norfolk. The Occaſion hereof was the Conference, an Account of which as given me by the Perſon chiefly concern'd begins this Book; at which *Mr.* Norris being preſent, and pretending not to be ſatisfied with what was then ſaid in the behalf of our Orders, writes to me the ſecond Paper hereafter Publiſhed concerning it, and that produced all the Letters that after follow. The laſt, I confeſs, was never ſent unto him; for on my finiſhing of it, being aſſured by ſuch accounts as I had received, that he was already gone over and firmly fix'd on the other ſide, as afterwards appeared to be true at his Death, which happened about the beginning of April following, I thought it too late to make any further Application to him, and therefore threw my Papers by in my Study, as now totally uſeleſs for the end deſigned. But after his Death, great offence being taken againſt me on ſeveral Occaſions by our Adverſaries, inſtead of other things to object, I was challenged for not anſwering a Letter wrote by *Mr.* Acton, a Jeſuite of this Place, which I ſuppoſing could be none other but the laſt I received from *Mr.* Norris, I again gathered my Papers together, to let them ſee that called upon me for an Anſwer, that I was ready to give it: And although it was afterwards denied that this Letter was at all intended thereby, but one ſent to another Perſon which I never knew any thing of, yet having on this occaſion put my Papers together, and looked them over, I was perſwaded by thoſe to whom I communicated them, that it might be of great uſe here to have them publiſh'd. For the Romiſh Emiſſaries that haunt this place ſeeming to have ſtudied no other

part

part of the Controverſie but that of our Orders, in their rounds where they go to and fro among us ſeeking whom they may delude, inculcate all the Arguments they can againſt the Validity of them; and making this the conſtant ſubject of what they have to ſay againſt us to ſuch of our people as they would Seduce, tell them, that we have no Miniſtry, and conſequently no Church, no Sacraments, and that therefore they muſt come over to them without examining any further into the Controverſie between us. By which ſilly Snare having catched ſome few, ſtumbled others, and filled the place in a manner with this Controverſie, I think an Antidote may be very proper where the Poiſon is ſo much ſpread, and therefore moſt what they have to ſay being put into the Letters ſent me by this Gentleman, I hope my Anſwers to them may very well ſerve for this purpoſe. That which perſwades me they may, is eſpecially the plainneſs with which they are wrote, for the Gentleman to whom they are directed having never had the advantage of any Scholaſtick Education, I endeavoured to lay all things as plain and eaſie before him as I could, whereby what I ſay in them being adapted to the meaneſt Capacity, I hope none that reads them but may go along with them, and receive ſatisfaction thereby as to the whole which our Adverſaries in the points diſcuſſed object againſt us. And that they may thus far be ſerviceable in our preſent Caſe to undeceive ſuch as are deluded among us, and prevent others from being ſo is the ſole end and deſign of my publiſhing of them.

Although the Conference which occaſioned thoſe Letters was that I was no way concern'd in or knew any thing of it till I had received Mr. Norris's *Paper, yet ſince his account is drawn ſo much to the diſadvantage of the Gentlemen concerned on our ſide, to publiſh that account alone would be to ſend abroad a Libel againſt them. And therefore that I might not be injurious to them in this particular, was the reaſon that I deſired of them their Account alſo to publiſh therewith, and that is it which here next immediately follows.*

H. Prideaux.

THE

THE ORDERS OF THE Church of England DEFENDED.

The True Account of a Conference between Mr. Earbury, *and Mr.* Acton *a* Jeſuit, *concerning the Validity of the Ordination of the Church of* England.

THE Company being ſet, Mr. *Earbury* began to ſpeak concerning the occaſion of their being met there. *Viz.* That Mr. *Thompſon* had departed from our Church and had been at a Popiſh Meeting, and that being demanded his Reaſon, he had given this, *viz. That he thought that the Miniſters of the Church of* England *were not in Orders*; *and that he had Friends who would prove it to our faces*: and that therefore we were now come to Anſwer all Objections.

Mr. *Acton* here Replyed, That it was our duty to *prove our ſelves in Orders*, and cited a part of Mr. *Earbury*'s Letter for it, though any one may ſee that that Paragraph was not deſigned for that purpoſe. The words of the

Letter are theſe; *I ſhall moſt gladly meet you there, not out of a principle of oſtentation or diſcontent, but meerly out of a ſenſe of that duty that I owe that Church of which I am a member (and as I hope to prove my ſelf) a Lawful Paſtor in it.* Mr. *Earbury* told him, that he did not think himſelf obliged to it, but yet he would begin with the proving part, and proceeded thus.

There are four things which your own Authors do think neceſſary to a due conveyance of Orders. Firſt, Authority of the perſon Conſecrating. Secondly, The Form. Thirdly, That which they call the Matter. Fourthly, Quality of the perſons receiving Ordination.

Mr. *Acton* excepted againſt the Form of Ordination made in *Edward* the Sixth's Time, and bid Mr. *Earbury* prove Syllogiſtically that that was ſufficient to convey the character of a Prieſt; which Mr. *Earbury* immediately did by this Argument. If our Saviours Form of Ordination was compleat, *viz.* (*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*) then the Form uſed in *Edward* the Sixth's time (being the very ſame) muſt be compleat alſo, but our Saviours was compleat therefore ours was. To this Mr. *Acton* anſwered, That our Saviour had a ſupream Authority, and might uſe what Form he pleaſed (though never *defective*) but we had no Authority to uſe a *defective* Form. Mr. *Earbury* told him, that though we had not the ſame Authority to impoſe a Form, yet we had liberty to uſe that Form which our Saviour uſed, eſpecially when the Form was expreſſive of the power given; and ſo offered to prove that the Form of Ordination in *Edward* the Sixth's time, was not deficient in expreſſing the particular office for which the Holy Ghoſt was given. Here Mr. *Earbury*'s *Amanuenſis* did throw up his Pen and Paper, ſo that Mr. *Earbury* was forced to write down his Anſwers to Mr. *Acton* with his own hand, and yet Mr. *Acton* was pleaſed to retain his own *Amanuenſis* to obſerve all advantages. But whereas ſome do ſay that Mr. *Earbury* did allow of Mr. *Actons* anſwers to his firſt Argument; this is ſo far from truth that Mr. *Earbury* for his vindication has ſent this following note to Mr. *Acton*, *viz.* *I do affirm that to aſſert that our Saviour uſed a form in Ordination, that was defective in Eſſentials, is derogatory from his wiſdom, and little better then blaſphemy.* But to proceed, Mr. *Earbury* pulled out a Common Prayer-book, with our Form of Ordination, and therein ſhewed that the deſignation of the perſon to the particular office of Prieſthood, was ſufficiently expreſſed in many places of the Form made in *Edward* the Sixth's Time.

For firſt, The perſons were to be preſented to the Biſhop with theſe words, *Reverend Father in God, I preſent unto you theſe perſons preſent to be admitted to the Order of Prieſthood*; Then the Biſhop ſpeaks to the people, *Good people theſe be they whom we purpoſe, God willing, to receive this day into the Order of Prieſthood*; and the People pray God, *Mercifully to behold his Servants now called to the Office of Prieſthood*: Not to mention other places in the Ordinal to the ſame effect, which Mr. *Earb.* then for brevity omitted and did argue from thence,

thence, that since the intention of the Church to ordain the person to the particular office of a Priest, was sufficiently expressed in the Ordinal before and after the imposition of hands, it was not absolutely necessary that the particular Office of Priesthood, should be expressed at the imposition of hands, for since the end of speech is only to express the intentions and conceptions of the mind, where that is sufficiently made known, there is no further need of words. Here Mr. *Acton* asked Mr. *Earbury*, whether the intention alone was sufficient to convey the Character? Mr. *Earbury* answered, No, and not as some say, Ay, and that he was contradicted therein by his Brother *Kipping*, which Mr. *Earbury* does affirm to be utterly false. For how could he affirm that the intention alone was sufficient when he was pleading for the validity of King *Edward*'s Form, and when he found that they insisted on the the cavil Mr. *Earbury* gave in this answer in Writing, and gave it to them, *viz.* * *I do affert that it is not absolutely necessary that the particular name of the Office of a Priest, should be expressed in the words that immediately are conjoyned with the imposition of hands*; and for that he gave two Reasons. 1. *Because there was no positive command for it.* 2. *Because the Nature of the thing did not require it.* Mr. *Acton* took no notice of the two Reasons annexed to the answer of Mr. *Earbury*, but proceeded to ask questions to this purpose; (for Mr. *Earbury* had no *Amanuensis* to take his very words) *viz. Whether a Sacrament could confer a power that was not expressed?* Mr. *Earbury* took his pen and wrote down this answer, *viz.* * I do answer to this, *That if the particular Office to which the person is to be ordained be sufficiently understood from the foregoing part of the Ordinal, it is not essential to the due conveyance of Orders, that the words at the imposition of hands should express the particular office given by that Ordination.* Here Mr. *Acton* would needs have Mr. *Earbury* instead of Office to put in the word Power; Mr. *Earbury* refused, and told him, that he was not come thither to make him his Dictator; at last Mr. *Acton* urging him, he took the Pen and would have altered it, as may be seen by the original Paper, but Mr. *Kipping* forbad it, and thereupon Mr *Acton* bid his *Amanuensis* write down, that Mr. *Earbury*, and Mr. *Kipping* did disagree between themselves. Then Mr. *Acton* did still proceed to ask Mr. *Earbury* more questions, *viz.* First, whether Mr. *Earbury* beleived that the words of a Sacrament are operative and effective. Mr. *Earbury* answered, That he did beleive the words of a Sacrament to be operative and effective by a Divine Concurrence. Mr. *Acton* then demanded whether supposing the Prayers before and after the imposition of hands were left out, that then the words of King *Edward*'s Ordinal would confer the Character of a Priest. Mr. *Earbury* acknowledged that being there were different Orders in the Church, it would then be expedient that the intention of the Church as to the particular Order should be

* These are words Writ by his own hand at the Conference.

* This is taken verbatim out of his Papers.

made known, for ſince the Office of a Biſhop as well as of a Prieſt is conveyed by the ſame Holy Ghoſt, it is neceſſary that ſome part of the Ordinal ſhould expreſs for what end the Holy Ghoſt is then given: But ſince this is not the caſe of King *Edward's* Ordinal where the particular Office is expreſſed, Mr. *Earbury* asked what was that to the purpoſe; Mr. *Acton* then asked Mr. *Earbury* whether the Matter and Form of a Sacrament ought not to be conjoined? Whether that Baptiſm would be good, wherein the water was firſt ſprinkled, and the Form of words ſpoken a quarter of an hour after. Mr. *Earbury* told him, That he would not determine whether ſuch a Baptiſm was good, or no; in caſe of neceſſity where there was no wilful neglect of our Saviours inſtitution, but only an accidental miſcarriage: and this Mr. *Acton* commanded his *Amanuenſis* to put down as a great mark of his victory, and again preſſed Mr. *Earbury* with the queſtion, whether the Matter and Form ought not to be conjoined. Here Mr. *Kipping* declared his diſlike againſt ſuch unreaſonable proceedings (as he had often done before) and earneſtly deſired Mr. *Earbury* not to condeſcend to anſwer their queſtions, and upon that Mr. *Earbury* told Mr. *Acton*, that if he had any Argument to propound, he ſhould receive an immediate anſwer, but that he did not think himſelf obliged to give a poſitive anſwer to all the impertinent queſtions that Mr. *Acton* would be pleaſed to put to him; ſince he had ſaid enough before to prove that this was nothing to the purpoſe. Here Mr. *Acton* made a Rhetorical flouriſh to the people, and bid them take notice that Mr. *Earbury* refuſed to anſwer his queſtions, and Mr. *Acton* then told Mr. *Earbury* that he could prove us to have no true Prieſthood another way, *viz.* Becauſe our Form of Ordination does not expreſs the power of conſecrating the Euchariſt, and bid Mr. *Earbury* again prove that we had the power conveyed to us. Mr. *Earbury* undertook that task, and immediately wrote down this Argument. If by our Form of Ordination the whole power of a Prieſt be conferred, and the power of conſecrating the Euchariſt does belong to the Prieſtly Office, then by our Ordination we muſt neceſſarily receive the power of conſecrating the Euchariſt. But *&c.* This Mr. *Earbury* ſaid was as plain as that all the parts were contained in the whole, and he further quoted Father *Paul* who in his Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*, does report it to be the opinion of ſome of their own moſt eminent Divines, *That if their Church had not appointed another Form, theſe words* (be thou a Prieſt) *had been ſufficient to convey the Character.* Here Mr. *Acton* ſaid, *Aye*, but I deny you to be Prieſts, Mr. *Earbury* asked him why? he ſaid, becauſe it was not expreſſed in our Form of Ordination; Mr. *Earbury* told him that now he was gone back to his firſt Argument, which had been confuted before, that he diſputed in a circle, and that at this rate it was impoſſible ever to come to an end. Here Mr. *Acton* again asked Mr. *Earbury* whether a Sacrament could confer a power that was not expreſſed? Mr. *Earbury* wrote down this anſwer and read it to the Company, *viz. I do ſay that the*

words

words of Ordination may confer a power that is not particularly expreſſed ſo it be included in a more general term. Mr. *Earbury* does not remember that Mr. *Acton* made any reply to this, but that he repeated the queſtion without taking notice of it, and to the beſt of Mr. *Earbury*'s remembrance. Here Mr. *Thompſon* declared that he was as little ſatisfied as ever, for he expected to hear the *Naggs-head* Story, and concerning *Matthew Parker*'s conſecration, and of the *Act of Parliament* in the 8th. of *Elizabeth* for confirming our Ordination: but as for Matter and Form of a Sacrament, he underſtood not two words of it. Mr. *Earbury* then roſe from the Table and ſpoke to this effect. *viz.* Sir, I have long ſuffered you to uſe me rather like a School boy than a diſputant or a man, you have taken the liberty to ask queſtions and give no anſwer, but now you ſhall give a reſolution to one Argument I ſhall propound, nor ſhall you find an evaſion from it. *viz.* If perſons Ordained by this new Form were permitted to officiate without Re-Ordination in Queen *Mary*'s Reign, and if Cardinal *Pool* did actually diſpence with them, then we have the judgments of Papiſts themſelves, that the Form made in *Edward* the Sixth's time was not deficient in eſſentials. But Cardinal *Pool* did diſpence with all perſons Ordained by this Form, and returning to the Unity of the Church, *Ergo*, *&c.* Here Mr. *Earbury* does affirm that Mr. *Acton* was very loth to give any anſwer, alledging ſometimes that Queen *Mary* was but a Woman, and ſometimes that Mr. *Earbury* had now paſſed to another medium. Mr. *Earbury* replyed, that ſuch excuſes ſhould not ſerve his turn; that he had not paſſed to another medium, whilſt Mr. *Acton* could ſay any thing material to his laſt, and that he expected a direct anſwer or a candid confeſſion. Mr. *Acton* after long tergiverſation, pulled out a little Book out of his Pocket, which he ſaid was written by a Proteſtant Authour, though the falſity of that is ſo apparent that none would aſſert it but thoſe that are deficient either in ſincerity or in judgment. The Pamphlet bears the name of *Eraſtus* Junior, and out of that he read the Story of *Latimer*, and *Ridley*; the latter of which was not degraded from Epiſcopal Orders at his death, becauſe (as they pretend) Ordained by the new Form. Mr. *Earbury* acknowledged that Biſhops Ordained by the new Form, were not degraded at their Martyrdom. But what then, if they fixed all notes of diſgrace to increaſe the puniſhment of men put to death as obſtinate Hereticks, and yet received others in their Orders that returned to the pretended Unity of the Church, the Argument did ſtill hold good. Mr. *Acton* replyed, That if Queen *Mary* allowed ſome to be in true Orders that received them by the new Ordinal and not others, then ſhe was a Knave and a Fool. Mr. *Earbury* anſwered that that was no fault or concern of his, that he would prove the matter of Fact by ſufficient authorities, and that then the Controverſie muſt needs be at an end.

Here Mr. *Shaw* told Mr. *Acton*, That he had not dealt fairly, and that if he pleaſed he would maintain Mr. *Earbury*'s Argument againſt him? Mr.

Acton

Acton refuſed, ſaying, he had no reaſon to change his Man. Here there began to be many ſpeakers, and ſome of the *Romaniſts* talked of Parliamentary Orders, and the *Nags-head* Story, but Mr. *Earbury* does not remember that Mr. *Acton* ingaged in it.

SIR,

HAving peruſed your account of your Conference with Mr. Acton, *it appears to me to be very faithfully delivered, to be impartially and candidly related: for to the beſt of my memory there is nothing that was material omitted, nor any thing added, that might tend to the prejudice of your Adverſary; this is the real ſenſe of him that is yours,*

John Shaw, *Preſbyter Angl.*

SIR,

I Have peruſed the account of your diſcourſe with Mr. Acton; *and do find it to the beſt of my remembrance, to be a faithful and impartial relation of the whole Conference, And whereas the pretended account of* A. N. *has inſinuated a notorious falſhood; much reflecting upon both of us,* viz. That you ſhould aſſert that the intention alone was ſufficient, and that I ſhould deny it; *I think my ſelf obliged to undeceive the Reader, for thus it was; when Mr.* Acton *asked you whether the intention was ſufficient, you anſwered, that the intention as expreſſed in the Ordinal was ſufficient, (or to that effect) and when again he asked whether the intention alone was ſufficient; I replyed, no, meaning intention barely conſidered without Matter and Form, to which you did aſſent: And this is the plain Truth, witneſs my hand*

Richard Kipping

SIR,

I Have read this account of the Conference between you and Mr. A. *which, as well as I can pretend to remember a diſcourſe ſo long ago, I take impartially to contain the moſt material things that paſſed between you, but if you have offended on any ſide 'tis in being too candid to your Antagoniſt; for I very well remember that you frequently urg'd Mr.* A. *to write down his Anſwers as you did yours which he always declined, by ſaying it would be night before you ſhould bring any thing to a Concluſion; and would always cry you loſt time when you writ any thing: this I doubt not you will eaſily call to mind, I do likewiſe very well remember Mr.* S's *words to Mr.* A. *and Mr.* E. *that they had not anſwered your firſt Syllogiſm, and that he would defend it againſt either of them, which they declin'd according as you relate it.*

Richard Tiſdale, *A. B.*

Novemb.

Novemb. 10. 1687. One of the Vergers of our Church brought me this following in a Letter from Mr. *Anthony Norris* of *Norwich*, but without any name thereto.

A Summary of the Conference between Mr. Earbury *and Mr.* Kipping *of the one part; and Mr.* Acton *and Mr.* Brown *on the other: Impartially ſet down to the beſt of his memory, by one that is of the* Church of England, *and was an Auditor at the ſaid Conference, but neither ſide adviſed with in the drawing up this Account.*

The Queſtion was, *About the validity of the Church of* Englands *Orders.*

THe two former Gentlemen took upon them to prove them to be good, and laid down this Rule, That for making of Orders valid there were neceſſarily required theſe four things, *Authority*, *Form*, *Matter*, and *Capacity*. The other Gentlemen did agree all of them to be neceſſary, but becauſe they would ſhorten the diſpute, would except againſt only that of our Form, for that it was altered from the ancient; and although they confeſſed their own had been altered, yet never was in the eſſentials. Then Mr. *Earbury* laid down this Propoſition or Argument, that if our Saviours Form were good by which he made Prieſts, then was ours good, but our Saviours was good, therefore ours was. Mr. *Acton* diſtinguiſht upon his Major, and ſaid that though with us nothing could be a true Form that did not expreſs the power given, yet with our Saviour it was ſufficient, though it did not, who being God could do that which none other could, and therefore with him any thing which he ſhould pleaſe to make uſe of, that did not expreſs the power given was a good and ſufficient Form, though the ſame would not be ſo with us. The diſtinction was allowed, and ſo Mr. *Earbury* proceeded to prove that our Form did expreſs the power, and accordingly produced his Common-Prayer-Book to ſhow how it was therein expreſſed in the Form. Mr. *Acton* did allow it ſo to be in that Book, but alledged that in all our Prayer-Books from *Edward* the 6th. until 1652. the word Prieſt was not expreſſed in the Form of thoſe. This Mr. *Earbury* granted, and ſaid that though it did not, yet it was ſufficient becauſe it was intended, and then uſed ſeveral other Arguments.

guments to prove that it was intended Mr. *Acton* then would know of him, whether he would maintain that the intention was ſufficient, who did aſſert it was, but Mr. *Kipping* would not agree to it. Then upon Mr. *Actons* asking Mr. *Earbury*, that though it were expreſſed in the Prayers, and not in the Form, if all were cut off but the Form and Matter, whether that were ſufficient to make a good Prieſt; upon which Mr. *Earbury* would not then abide by his aſſertion, that the intention is ſufficient. The two former Gentlemen proceeded then to another Argument to prove our Orders good, becauſe they were allowed to be good by the Romiſh Church by Cardinal *Pool*, who allowed of the Orders given in *Edward* the 6th. days in the time of Queen *Mary*. Mr. *Acton* replyed that now they come to offer another medium, which was not to be allowed of unleſs they would agree firſt that they had no more to ſay as to the Form, or were content to give that over. But they ſaid it was nothing but what was ſtill depending upon the former. Mr *Acton* ſaid, That though it was againſt the Rules of the Schools, yet he ſhould go on, and proceed to give his anſwer unto their new medium, and ſo denyed that they were ever owned to be good by Cardinal *Pool*, upon which the other Gentlemen told him they had not the Books preſent to prove it, but ſhould do it in writing to him the next day, with citations of the Authors, that they would ſend to his Lodgings. Mr. *Acton* ſaid, he was ſure they never could do it, and though it belonged not to him to prove the contrary, yet he produced to them a Proteſtant Book ſetting forth the manner of the burning of Biſhop *Ridley* (I think it was that Biſhop) who being made Prieſt by the Popiſh Form they firſt degraded him of his Prieſthood, but not of his Epiſcopal Orders telling him they would not degrade him of theſe, for that they never lookt upon him for a Biſhop, who was ſuch by the Form of *Edward* the 6th. which did clearly prove they never allowed of the Orders to be good in *Edward* the 6th. days. The two former Gentlemen ſaid they could ſtay no longer, and ſo took their leaves.

If any other can ſay more then hath been in defence of our Orders, the Author hereof will be very thankful to receive it from them in Writing, which may come to him by the ſame hand by which he ſends this, and deſires this may be ſent him back again.

The Meſſenger that brought me the letter telling me that he had it from Mr. *Anthony Norris* though his name was not to it; I ſuppoſed it to be his, and therefore ſending to Mr *Earbury* concerning it, he brought me that account of the Conference which begins this Book, and that with this followving anſvver from my ſelf vvas ſent him the next day after.

LAſt Night a nameleſs Paper vvas brought me containing a relation of a certain diſcourſe that hapned betvveen one Mr. *Acton* a Gentleman of the Romiſh Communion, and tvvo Divines of our Church concerning the validity

validity of our Orders, and as far as I find by that paper the grand objection brought againſt them was from the alteration made in our Ordinal, *Anno* 1662. as if that were a tacit conſent on our ſide, that before this alteration was made our Ordinal was not ſufficient, and therefore no Orders could be conferred thereby, and conſequently that neither they which were ordained by it, or we that have derived our Orders from them have received any legal and ſufficient Ordination thereby. To which I anſwer. 1. That the putting in of Explanatory words to make things clearer and render them more free from cavil and objection cannot be well termed an alteration. 2. That ſuppoſing really there had been any ſuch alteration made as to the whole ſubſtance of the Form, yet this is no more then what the Church of *Rome* hath often done, there being ſcarce an age in which ſhe hath not conſiderably varyed from her ſelf herein, as may be ſeen by comparing thoſe many different Forms of Ordination uſed in the Church of *Rome*, which are collected together by *Morinus* a Learned Prieſt of that Church, in his book *de Ordinationibus*. 3. The alterations, or rather explanatory Additions made in our Ordinal in the Year 1662. were not inſerted out of any reſpect to the controverſie we have with the Church of *Rome*, but only to ſilence a cavil of the Presbyterians, who from the old Ordinal drew an Argument to prove that there was no difference between a Biſhop and a Prieſt, becauſe (as they ſay) their Offices were not at all diſtinguiſhed in the words whereby they were conferred on them when ordained, or any new power given a Biſhop which he had not afore as a Prieſt. For the words of Ordination in King *Edward*'s Ordinal are for a Prieſt as followeth, [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins thou doſt forgive they are forgiven, and whoſe ſins thou doſt retain they are retained, and be thou a faithful diſpencer of the Word of God, and of his Sacraments, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt:* And for a Biſhop [*Take the Holy Ghoſt, and remember that thou ſtir up the Grace of God which is in thee by impoſition of hands. For God hath not given thee the Spirit of Fear, but of Power, and Love, and Soberneſs.* And they ſo continued till the review of our Liturgy. *Anno* 1662. and then to obviate the above-mentioned cavil of the Presbyterians thoſe explanatory words were inſerted, whereby the diſtinction between a Biſhop and a Prieſt is more clearly and unexceptionably expreſſed. So that now the words of Ordination for a Prieſt are [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt for the office and work of a Prieſt in the Church of God now committed to thee by impoſition of our hands. Whoſe ſins thou doſt forgive*, &c.] And for a Biſhop [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt for the office and work of a Biſhop now committed to thee by the impoſition of our hands, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt; and remember that thou*, &c.] But 4. Having thus ſtated the Caſe, and laid before you the differences between the new Ordinal and the Old; Now to come to the main of the objection, I aſſert that had the old Ordinal been continued without any ſuch Addition, although it might not

ſo clearly have obviated the cavils of Adverſaries, yet the Orders conferred by it would have been altogether as valid. And as to the Objection made by the Gentlemen of the Church of *Rome*, that the words of our old Ordinal do not ſufficiently expreſs the Office conferred thereby, this muſt be underſtood either in reference to the Prieſtly Ordination, or the Epiſcopal or both. And 1. As to the Prieſtly Ordination there ſeems not to be the leaſt ground for it, becauſe the Form in the old Ordinal doth as fully expreſſe the Office, Power and Authority of a Prieſt as need be required in theſe words. [*Whoſe ſins thou doſt forgive they are forgiven, and whoſe ſins thou doſt retain they are retained. And be thou a faithful diſpenſer of the Word of God, and of his Sacraments.*] Wherein the whole of the Prieſtly Office is expreſſed. But 2. As to the Epiſcopal Ordination the whole pinch of the Argument ſeems to lye there, becauſe in the old Form of the words ſpoken at the impoſition of hands, the Office and Authority of a Biſhop (they ſay) is not ſo particularly ſpecifyed. To this I anſwer firſt, That I think this ſufficiently done in the words of the Form, [*Remember that thou ſtir up the Grace of God which is in thee by impoſition of hands, for God hath not given us the Spirit of Fear, but of Power and Love, and Soberneſs.*] For they are the very words of St. *Paul* to *Timothy* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, (*Epiſt.* 2. *c.* 1. *ver.* 6, 7.) Whereby he exhorts and ſtirs him up to the Execution of his Epiſcopal office, and they have alvvays been underſtood to refer thereto, and therefore I think they may be alſo allovved ſufficient to expreſs the ſame Epiſcopal office, when ſpoken to any other, and fully determine to what Office the Holy Ghoſt is given by impoſition of hands in the Form mentioned, and properer for this purpoſe than any other, becauſe of the greater Authority vvhich they muſt have, in that they are taken out of the Holy Scripture. But if men vvill cavil on, and ſtill object that the Name of Biſhop is not expreſſed in the Form, or the duties and povver of that Office vvith ſufficient clearneſs ſpecified in the vvords mentioned, the objection lies much more againſt the Roman Ordinal than ours, as being much more defective herein. For the vvhole Form uſed therein at the Conſecration of a Biſhop is no more than this, [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*] that being all that is ſaid at the impoſition of hands, and aſſerted by them to be the vvhole Form of Epiſcopal Ordination. And therefore *Vaſques* a Learned Jeſuit, and moſt Eminent School-man makes the ſame objection againſt the Roman Ordinal, that the Romaniſts do againſt ours. For in *Tertiam Thomæ Diſp.* 240. *c.* 5. *N.* 57. His words are, *Illa verba* [*accipe Spiritum Sanctum*] *quæ a tribus Epiſcopis ſimul cum impoſitione manuum dicuntur ſuper Ordinandum uſque adeo generalia videntur, ut proprium munus aut gradum Epiſcopi non exprimant, quod tamen neceſſarium videbatur pro formâ, i. e.* Theſe words *Receive the Holy Ghoſt*, which are ſpoken by three Biſhops together with impoſition of hands over the perſon to be Ordained ſeem to be ſo general, that they do not expreſs the proper office and degree of a Biſhop, which yet did ſeem neceſſary for the Form

Form of his Ordination. But to this he himſelf gives a ſolution (N. 60. of the ſame chapter) in theſe following words. *Neque obſtat id quod ſupra dicebamus, verba illa* accipe Spiritum Sanctum *admodum generalia eſſe, nam quamvis in illis ſecundum ſe conſideratis non denotetur munus aut gradus peculiaris Epiſcopi, & pro quocunque alio ordine dici poſſent, tamen prout proferuntur adhibitâ a tribus Epiſcopis in unum Congregatis manuum impoſitione pro materia rectè quidem denotant gradum Epiſcopi ad quem electus ordinatur. Sic enim ſimul imponentes per verba illa denotant ſe eum in ſuum conſortium admittere, & ad hoc Spiritum ſanctum tribuere, ac proinde in eodem ordine Epiſcopali ſecum ipſum conſtituere. Cum tamen manuum impoſitio ab uno tantum Epiſcopo adhibita, & eadem verba* accipe Spiritum Sanctum, *paucis aliis additis ab eodem in ordinatione Diaconi prolata neque ſecundum ſe neque prout ab ipſo Epiſcopo dicta & huic materiæ applicata peculiare munus aut gradum Diaconi denotent, neque enim prout dicta a uno Epiſcopo cum tali materia denotare poſſunt ordinatum admitti ad conſortium Epiſcopi in hoc potius ordine quam in alio, cum unus Epiſcopus tam ſit miniſter ordinis Sacerdotii & Subdiaconatus, quam Diaconatus: e contrario vero tres Epiſcopi ſolius ordinis Epiſcopalis miniſtri ſint, ideo autem exiſtimo Chriſtum voluiſſe ut Eccleſia illius tantum verbis, quæ ſecundum ſe Generalia ſunt in hac ordinatione uteretur, ut denotaret abundantiam gratiæ Spiritus Sancti, quæ Epiſcopis in Ordinatione confertur. Plus enim videtur eſſe dari Spiritum Sanctum abſolutè, quam dari ad hunc vel illum effectum peculiarem, i. e.* Neither doth that hinder, which I have ſaid before, that theſe words [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*] were too general. For although by theſe words conſidered in themſelves the Office or peculiar degree of a Biſhop cannot be denoted, and they may be alſo ſaid for any other Order; but as they are pronounced (the impoſition of hands of three Biſhops joyned together being alſo had therewith for the matter of Ordination) they do truly denote the degree of a Biſhop, to which the perſon Elected is Ordained. For they after this manner laying on their hands all together by thoſe words do denote that they do receive him into their fellowſhip, and to this end do give the Holy Ghoſt, and therefore do place him in the ſame Epiſcopal Order with themſelves, whereas the impoſition of hands made uſe of by one Biſhop only, and the ſame words [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*] with a few others added to them ſpoken by the ſame Biſhop in the Ordination of a Deacon do not either as conſidered in themſelves, or as ſpoken by the Biſhop, and applyed to this matter denote the peculiar office or degree of a Deacon, neither can they as ſpoken by one Biſhop, with ſuch a matter denote the Ordained to be admitted into fellowſhip with the Biſhop rather in this Order than in another, ſeeing one Biſhop is as well the Miniſter of conferring the Orders of Prieſthood, and of the Sub-Deacon, as of the Deacon. But on the contrary three Biſhops are only the Miniſters of conferring Epiſcopal Ordination. And I do therefore think it to be the Will of Chriſt, that his Church ſhould in this Ordination uſe ſuch words as conſider-

ed in themſelves are only general, that it might denote thereby that abundance of Grace of the Holy Ghoſt which is conferred on Biſhops in their Ordination. For it ſeems to be much more that the Holy Ghoſt be given abſolutely, than that it be given for this or that peculiar effect. Thus far the Learned Jeſuit, and if this may be allowed to be a ſufficient ſolution of the objection againſt the Ordinal of the Church of *Rome*, it muſt alſo be a ſufficient ſolution of the ſame objection againſt our Ordinal. For with us as well as in the Church of *Rome* there are always three Biſhops preſent at the Ordination of a Biſhop, which altogether lay on their hands on the Biſhop Elect when Ordained, and not only this Circumſtance, but many others in the Adminiſtration of this Office according to our Ordinal do as fully ſhow what Order the Perſon, on whom they thus lay on their hands, and pronounce the abovementioned Form of Conſecration over, is to be admitted to. The complex of the whole office ſhows it. For the perſon to be Ordained, or conſecrated is preſented to the Metropolitan as one to be made a Biſhop; he takes the Oath of Canonical obedience to the Metropolitan as one to be made a Biſhop; is prayed for as one to be made a Biſhop; is examined or interrogated as one to be made a Biſhop; is veſted in the Epiſcopal Robes, and is Ordained by a Form never uſed but in the Ordination of a Biſhop; and all theſe together with many other like circumſtances in that office, too long all to be put down, are certainly ſufficient to determine the words of the Form to the Epiſcopal office only, were there nothing in the words themſelves to do it, as it is certain there is not in the Form uſed by the Church of *Rome* to this purpoſe.

As to what was ſaid in reference to Biſhop *Ridley*'s degradation only from his Prieſtly office before his Martyrdom to prove his Epiſcopal office not then allowed to be valid, I obſerve theſe following particulars.

Firſt, That in theſe times of bitter perſecution againſt us, our adverſaries (as is uſual in ſuch caſes) proceeded rather according to their Rage and Fury, than the juſt rules either of Truth or Reaſon, or what they themſelves were uſed to practice at other times.

Secondly, That the voiding of Leaſes made by Proteſtant Biſhops in King *Edward*'s time depending upon the voiding of their Orders; This was ſo earneſtly endeavoured by thoſe Popiſh Biſhops that came in their places in Queen *Mary*'s time for ſecular intereſt.

Thirdly, That notwithſtanding thoſe were thus dealt with, that would not come in to the Church of *Rome* at its reſtauration in Queen *Mary*'s days, yet thoſe that did, although Ordained by King *Edward*'s Ordinal, kept both their Livings and their Orders too (and thoſe not a few) without any new Ordination, all being ſalved by a diſpenſation, which could not have been done had their Orders by that Ordinal been conferred contrary to Chriſts inſtitution, againſt which there can be no diſpenſation by any power on Earth whatſoever.

Fourth-

Fourthly, All that B *Bonner* pretended to (who was the fierceſt for the invalidity of all our Orders, and reaped moſt benefit thereby in the voiding of Biſhop *Ridleys* Leaſes) was to ſupply the defects of them, not totally to annul what was done before as appears by the injunctions, which he procured from the Queen to carry with him in the firſt viſitation of his Dioceſs after his reſtoration. And what theſe defects were as to the Prieſtly office he himſelf tells us in a Book which he wrot againſt our Orders. For all there which he aſſigns (and which is in Truth the whole, which the Gentlemen of *Rome* inſiſt upon when they come cloſe to the point,) is that in our Ordinal of Ordaining Prieſts this form was wanting [*Receive thou power to offer Sacrifices to God, and to celebrate Maſs both for the Living and the Dead,*] and if this be a defect in our Ordinal, and on this account an Eſſential part is wanting in our Orders (as they contend) it hath alſo been a defect in the Church of *Rome* it ſelf, which for near a thouſand years together never uſed any ſuch form in their Ordination, and it is not now uſed to this day either in the Greek Church, or the Churches of the *Maronites* upon Mount *Libanus*, although the Church of *Rome* allows the Orders of the former to be good, and the latter are members of their own Communion. Nay, it is further to be obſerved, that thoſe Greeks which live in *Rome* not only under the Popes Juriſdiction to which they have ſubmitted, but alſo under his very noſe, and have Churches there maintained for them at his coſt and charges, are ſtill allowed to be Ordained by their own Ordinal, in which this Form is wanting, as the above-mentioned *Morinus* a Learned Prieſt of the Romiſh Communion, and one that lived ſometime at *Rome* doth atteſt, and therefore if for this defect (as they call it) our Orders be null and invalid (as now they would have) why do they allow them to be good and valid in others, which have received them with the ſame defect alſo, or rather how can they be good and valid in themſelves, who have received them from ſuch, as for near a thouſand years (as I have afore obſerved) never uſed this Form.

H. Prideaux.

Nov. 11*th.* 1687.

But ſometime after hearing that what was urged concerning Biſhop *Ridly's* not being degraded from his Epiſcopal Orders at his Martyrdom, to be much talked of amongſt Mr. *Aſtons* Friends, as if it were an argument which did invincibly overthrow what Mr. *Earbury* aſſerted concerning our Orders having been admitted to be good in Queen *Mary's* time, I ſent Mr. *Norris* this further paper concerning that matter.

S I R,

I Being deſirous to give you ſatisfaction to the utmoſt concerning the point you propoſed to me, think my ſelf obliged to add this further paper to that I have

I have already ſent you to undeceive you as to what was objected concerning Biſhop *Ridley*'s not being allowed to be a Biſhop at his Martyrdom. The Argument as I take it from the paper you ſent me runs thus. Mr. *E.* urged that our Orders were allowed as to their eſſentials to be good in Queen *Mary*'s dayes, and only culpable as to Canonical defects. And this he proved, becauſe ſuch as had received Orders by our Ordinal in King *Edward*'s days, on their coming in again into the Communion of the Church of *Rome* in Queen *Mary*'s Reign vvere not Ordained again, but vvere received to officiate in their functions by a diſpenſation only. But a diſpenſation cannot ſalve an eſſential, but only a Canonical defect, it not being in the power of any authority on Earth to diſpenſe vvith an eſſential of Chriſts inſtitution. To this Mr. *A.* anſwered by denying the matter of fact, that they that were thus Ordained were not ſo received to adminiſter in their functions by virtue of a diſpenſation only, as Mr. *Earbury* alledged; but that their Orders in Queen *Mary*'s days were reckoned totally null and void, and for proof hereof urged Biſhop *Ridley*'s being degraded from his Prieſtly office at his Martyrdom, but not from his Epiſcopal. For he being ordained Prieſt by the Popiſh Ordinal they allowed him theſe Orders to be good, but having been made Biſhop by King *Edward*'s Ordinal; for that reaſon they would not allow him to be a Biſhop, whereas Arch-Biſhop *Cranmer* who had received both Orders by the Romiſh Ordinal was degraded from both, as being allowed for that reaſon to be legally made both Prieſt and Biſhop. And this I ſuppoſe is the utmoſt that Argument can be made of by whomſoever urged, and ſo I find it laid down by Mr. *Walker* in his Relation of the Engliſh Reformation. But the whole goes upon a very groſs miſtake. For Biſhop *Ridley* was made Biſhop of *Rocheſter* in the firſt year of King *Edward* the ſixth's Reign, having been deſigned for that See by King *Henry* the 8th. his Father, and conſecrated not by the new Ordinal, which they find ſo much fault with, but by the old Popiſh one on the 5th. of *September*, *Anno Domini* 1547. For the Act of Parliament which appointed the making of the new Ordinal was not enacted till the firſt of *February* in the 4th. year of King *Edward*'s Reign, *Anno Domini* 1549. and it was the *March* after in the beginning of the year 1550. before it was fully compleated, ſo that *Ridley* was two years and a half Biſhop before the new Ordinal had any being, and therefore could not be ordained by it, or his Epiſcopal orders invalidated for any defect therein. However I acknowledge the matter of fact to be ſo as urged, and that Biſhop *Ridley* was treated at his Martyrdom juſt as they relate, being degraded by them from his Prieſtly orders, but not from his Epiſcopal, becauſe they would not allovv him ever to have received any ſuch. But if you ask me the reaſon then of this their proceeding vvith him I can give you no other then vvhat I have told you before in my laſt paper I ſent you, i. e. The blind rage and impetuous malice of thoſe that perſecuted this Learned and Holy Biſhop,

vvhich

which hurryed them on to ſuch things in their proceedings againſt him, as were neither agreeable to reaſon or their own eſtabliſhed doctrine as to this particular.

For firſt they cannot ſay he was no legal Biſhop although ordained by their own Ordinal becauſe this was done in time of Schiſm after King *Henry* the 8th. had ſeparated from the Church of *Rome*. For if this be granted it will then follow by the ſame reaſon that neither *Heath*, *Thurlby*, nor *Bonner* himſelf (who were the chief ſupporters of the Papal cauſe in Queen *Mary*'s dayes,) were true Biſhops, as being conſecrated in the ſame manner as *Ridley* was after this ſeparation. Neither,

Secondly, Can it be ſaid that his Orders were null for the pretended crime of Hereſie. For this contradicts the whole current of their own Divines who all hold, that orders imprint an indelible character in the perſon ordained, which neither Schiſm, Hereſie, or any thing elſe can ever blot out, but that whoſoever is to be ordained a Biſhop although he be an Heretick doth not only receive this character, but alſo can beget the ſame character in any other that ſhall be ordained by him. And therefore according to this Doctrine, although Biſhop *Ridley* had been an Heretick, and all his Ordainers Hereticks alſo, as they would have them to be, yet would his Ordination be good, and as true a character of the Epiſcopal office be Imprinted on him as on any other. And this they are neceſſitated to grant from the practice of the ancient Fathers and Councils of the Church, who ever received Hereticks on their Repentance into the ſame orders, which they had afore received from thoſe Heretical Biſhops, to whoſe doctrine they had adher'd without any new Ordination. For although it be acknowledged a great ſin, either to give or receive Holy orders to propagate falſe and Heretical Doctrines, yet it hath ever been allowed that they are good and valid whenever thus conferred, and that the true characters of a Biſhop and a Prieſt may be found among the worſt of Hereticks, as well as the beſt of Chriſtians, becauſe the abuſe of the office doth not annull the Commiſſion. But that being written in indelible characters in the ſoul of him that is ordained, they tell us, it ſhall there for ever remain, not only in this Life, but alſo in that which is to come, and then not only in Heaven but alſo in Hell it ſelf, and that to all Eternity, as may be ſhown out of ſeveral of their beſt reputed Authors. And thus far therefore it is plain that it was not any defect in the ordinal, by which Biſhop *Ridley* was ordained, or the pretended crime of Hereſie or Schiſm, either in him or in them that ordained him Biſhop, that could null and make void his Epiſcopal Orders, according to the Doctrine of the Romaniſts themſelves, that were ſo forward to paſs this ſentence upon him, and there being no other reaſon which they can alledge for it to juſtifie theſe their proceedings with him, it doth neceſſarily follow, that their denying him to be a Biſhop can be reſolved into nothing elſe, but that ſame rage and malice againſt him which made

made them take away his Life. And proceedings of this nature are no ſtrange things in the Church of *Rome*, nothing having been more common among them than in the height of their animoſities to void and annul the orders of thoſe they had a quarrel with: and inſtances enough of this may be given eſpecially among the Succeſſions of Pope *Formoſus*, every new Pope almoſt for ſeveral Succeſſors after him annulling all the Acts of his Predeceſſor, and ſome of them the orders alſo conferred by him for no other reaſon, but for the hatred which they bore each other according as they were of different parties for or againſt the proceedings of *Formoſus* that was Pope before them. And if the truth be fully examined into, no other reaſon will appear for their like proceedings with us. We are not of their party, but after having long ſubmitted to their unreaſonable uſurpations, and unwarrantable impoſitions will now bear them no longer, but having caſt off this heavy yoke from our necks have thereby cut them ſhort of a great part of their Empire, and deprived them of vaſt incomes, which they annually received out of thoſe Kingdoms in larger ſums then from any other nation under their bondage, and therefore looking on us as the *Egyptians* did on the *Iſraelites*, when they withdrew themſelves from their bondage, although it were to ſerve the living God, purſue after us with the ſame malice, and when out of the bitterneſs of it they have deprived ſo many of us of our Lives, no wonder they will not allow us our orders. But how bad ſoever either our orders, our Liturgy, or any other part of the Reformation eſtabliſht among us, may at preſent be eſteemed; yet we have heard of the time, when if his Holineſs might but have had his Supremacy and his *Peter-pence* again, all might have been allowed to be good and valid. Pope *Paul* the 4th. and after him Pope *Pius* the 4th. having ſeveral times offered it Queen *Elizabeth* to confirm all that was done in the Reformation of this Church, and allow both our orders and our Liturgy too, provided ſhe would again reſtore them to that Authority and Revenue which their Predeceſſors formerly had in this Land. And as long as there was any hope for the ſucceeding of this project, Papiſts were permitted both to frequent our Churches and joyn with us in our Prayers, and it was the General practice of that whole party for the firſt ten years of her Reign ſo to do. But afterwards when the Court of *Rome* found that the Queen was immoveably fixed againſt what they propoſed, and all likelihood taken from them of again recovering their power in this Land by any Conceſſion from her, then firſt began they in the 11th. year of her Reign to command their Votaries to make a total ſeparation from us, and to proceed in the moſt rigorous manner poſſible by Excommunications, Sentences of Depoſition, underhand Treaſons, and open violences againſt the Queen and all that adhere to her, to condemn our Church of Apoſtacy from the Faith, and to denounce all her eſtabliſhments, which afore of their own accord they had offered to confirm and allow, to be Heretical, Falſe, Diabolical, and what other like name they were

were pleaſed to affix thereto, and all this for no other reaſon, but becauſe we would not again admit them to that Tyrannical ſupremacy over us, which had on ſo juſt grounds been caſt out of our Land, by which it appears that Empire is the only thing in reality which thoſe men look after, and all things elſe are to be allowed or denyed as they may comport therewith.

I am Sir,

Your affectionate Friend,

Humphrey Prideaux.

The ſame Meſſenger that carryed this Paper to Mr. *Norris* brought from him this following in Anſwer to the firſt Paper I ſent him, it being on Fryday Night *November the 25th.*

SIR,

THE enſuing are my promiſed thoughts upon your Paper, which neither Mr. *Acton* nor any of thoſe Gentlemen had the leaſt hand in.

The exception amongſt others which our Adverſaries take againſt our Orders is, that in the Ordinal of *Edward* the Sixth's days the power given by that Form of making Prieſts did not expreſs for what office, which our Church judged ſo neceſſary that it ſhould, that in the review of it in *Charles the Second*'s Time that defect was ſupplyed by the addition of the word Prieſt, which the Biſhop is now to expreſs in the Form when he lays his hands upon the perſon to be ordained unto that office.

In your paper you vindicate the former Ordinal by theſe ſeveral ways.

Firſt, That the addition did not ſuppoſe any defect in it before, but was put in only to avoid the cavils of the *Preſbyterians*, who at that time were aſſembled by Commiſſion with our Church-men upon review of our Liturgy.

Secondly, For that it was before agreeable to Chriſts own practice.

Thirdly, To the Practice of the Romiſh Church, who alſo owned our Prieſthood to be good by the Conceſſions of Cardinal *Pool*. It being nothing but the truth which I look at, have therefore fairly and candidly ſummed up and recited the utmoſt ſtrength of your Paper.

To your firſt I ſay, That for the word Prieſt and Biſhop to be added to the new Form for avoiding all cavils from the *Preſbyterians*, who ſo much hated the name of both, I will appeal almoſt to all the World, whether that could be thought to be the true Reaſon. Beſides our ſelves do grant that even to thoſe very men it was thought defective, for the very ſame reaſon the Romaniſts did, and therefore muſt neceſſarily conclude it to be very deficient being ſo apparent unto them as well as unto the others. But the true reaſon

of that addition I take to be from two books, which came out not above a year before called *Eraſtus* Senior, and *Eraſtus* Junior, which did make appear, that the power given at our Ordination of Prieſts was not expreſſed in the Form of that office, by which they were no more Prieſts then any Lay-man confirmed by the Biſhop. If our Church had not thought it eſſentially neceſſary to have made that addition, ſhe never would ſo have expoſed our Ordinal to the juſt cenſures of our adverſaries in ſo high a concern for a meer circumſtantial matter, which alteration was not in the preliminary part of it, or in the prayers before or after, but in the very eſſential part of it, and therefore by ſuch an addition ſhe could not but think it very defective before.

To your ſecond I ſay, That although our Saviour who alſo was God could conferre the whole office of Prieſt without any Form expreſſing the power given, or could make any Form ſufficient for that end yet doth it not therefore follow that we can do it, but in the ordinary way. But when our Saviour ſaid, *Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins you remit*, &c. They were not by thoſe very words alone made compleat and intire Prieſts, they were thereby ſo far as to remit ſins; but not to Conſecrate or Make preſent the body and blood of Chriſt, which power he gave them, when he inſtituted the Euchariſt, and ſaid, *this do in Remembrance of me*. Now though the word Prieſt was not expreſſed in our Saviours Form, yet was it by equivalency, by expreſly giving them all the power that belonged to that office. If our Saviour had only ſaid, *be thou a Prieſt*, it had been as ſufficient for all the offices of it, as when he expreſly gave them power to perform all the offices of it without expreſly giving the Title. But our Ordinal did not expreſs the whole power given either by name or equivalency. For it did not give power to Conſecrate the Euchariſt, though it did to be diſpencers and faithful Miniſters of it, which amounts to no more than diſtributers which every Deacon is as capable of as a Prieſt. And if diſpenſing ſhould import to be Stewards of the Myſterys of God, that alſo imports no more then to be Conſervators, or Truſtees of what ſhould be committed to them, not that they are thereby the makers of it. That becauſe I am intruſted or made Steward it ſhould therefore neceſſarily follow that I have power to make that with which I am intruſted, I hope our caſe depends not upon ſuch a forced and unnatural a conſequence.

If it ſhould be objected that our Saviour did not then give the power to Conſecrate the Euchariſt, when he ſaid to his Apoſtles, *Do this in remembrance of me*, but was only a command to continue the Rite and Cuſtom of it in the Church, and therefore were compleat Prieſts from thoſe words only by which he gave them power to remit ſins. To this I anſwer, That if our Church had thought any ſufficiently impowred to Conſecrate the Euchariſt by virtue only of thoſe words to remit ſins, we then muſt make her highly guilty of notorious idle Tautology in her Form of Ordination, when after ſhe hath

hath given power to remit ſins ſhould alſo at the ſame time diſtinctly give power to diſpence the Sacraments. But by her giving ſuch diſtinct power to diſpence the Sacraments after ſhe had given power to remit ſins, ſhe could not think that to be the ſenſe of our Saviours words, but the other, that by bidding them *do this in Remembrance of him*, that he did then give them power to Conſecrate the Euchariſt, which I take clearly to be the ſenſe of the Church, whoſe Authority I ſhall preferre before any ſingle perſons whatſoever. Beſides that our Saviour ſhould then command them to do that which they had power for to do, is more like to a cruel Tyrant than a moſt Merciful and Compaſſionate Maſter.

To your Third and laſt I ſay, That the Romaniſts making alteration in their Ordinals ſignifie nothing, unleſs you can ſhew me where they have done it in ſuch an eſſential part of it as we have. Although they have added that to theirs of offering ſacrifice for the living and the dead, yet in regard they do before in their Ordinal expreſly give all Prieſtly power, which we did not, the other is but an inſtruction to let them know what power they had received, and for what they were to make uſe of it by virtue of that all Prieſtly power expreſly given them before, as appears by the words in their Ordinal, which in ours was neither given in general, nor in particular to Conſecrate or make preſent Chriſts body and blood in the Holy Euchariſt, as was obſerved before. If we had then as now but ſaid be thou a Prieſt, I grant it had been ſufficient for all the offices of it, although none of them had been particularly expreſſed in our Ordinal.

As to what *Morinus* hath ſaid about the Greek and Roman Ordinals not giving diſtinct power expreſly to Conſecrate makes nothing at all, ſo long as they gave them all Prieſtly power: Unleſs you can prove any of their Ordinals do not expreſly give them Prieſthood, the exceptions out of him of not giving power to Conſecrate is nothing at all to the true ſtate of the Queſtion between us.

Sir, As to what you ſay from *Vaſquez* relates only to a Biſhop, who doth not thereby receive any new character, then what he had afore as a Prieſt, and is only the ſame power and character further extended which was before virtually in him from his Prieſthood, and therefore thoſe words [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt and ſtir up the grace*, &c.] may be ſufficient alone for that, though not for a Prieſt, who doth receive a new power and character. Beſides the ſame Author in the ſame Tome which you quote doth expreſly ſay that by the words, *Receive the Holy Ghoſt*, *and whoſe ſins you remit*, &c. doth not alone make an intire Prieſt, and that he hath not power to Conſecrate by virtue of them, and you know, *Sir*, the point between us now is only that of Prieſthood.

As to that *Sir* vvhich you ſay, That they vvould not degrade Biſhop *Ridley* of his Epiſcopal office vvas not upon account that they thought him no Biſhop,

but for the benefit of the Leaſes to his Succeſſor *Bonner*. But why then did they at the ſame time degrade *Latimer* of his Epiſcopal office, who was made ſuch by the Roman Ordinal; which *Ridley* was not by which *Sir* you may plainly ſee what the true reaſon was of both, which I take not at all to be what *Sir* you were pleaſed for to ſurmiſe.

Finally, whereas you were pleaſed to ſay our Prieſts were owned for good by the Romaniſts themſelves, when you ſhall be pleaſed *Sir* to make proof thereof I ſhall think it then time, and not before to take it into my conſideration, in the mean time *Sir* if you pleaſe to look into Mr. *Fox*, and do believe what he ſays, you ſhall find what complaints he makes of the Roman Clergy againſt the Proteſtant Clergy in Queen *Mary* days, what havock they made with the latter in that they would force them all to be Re-Ordained again. *Sir*, I am ſtill in the ſame Communion which if I ſhould ever change, it can be imputed to nothing more then from ſome of our own Clergy-men, of whom I do expreſly exempt your ſelf,

SIR,

I am your moſt humble Servant,

A. N.

Three days after I had alſo this following paper ſent me by the ſame Gentleman in anſwer to the laſt I ſent him.

SIR,

I Could not conveniently before yeſterday read over your ſecond Paper ſupplemental to your firſt. As to Biſhop Ridley *you may find by Mr.* Maſon's *Vindication of him by the reaſons he urg'd, that he did account him to be Conſecrated not by the Old but by the New Ordinal, and the Popes Commiſſioners refuſing to degrade him as to that Office, and yet did Biſhop* Latimer *in both is a clear Teſtimony that they would not do it to the one becauſe they thought him conſecrated by the New Ordinal. Beſides Dr.* Burnet *hath expreſly declared that* Ridley *was made Biſhop by the New Ordinal in King* Edward's *time. Beſides other Biſhops they did not degrade.*

As to their coming to our Churches until the 10th. *of Queen* Elizabeth, *ſo to my knowledge did moſt of the Prebendarys of your Cathedral with the reſt of the Epiſcopal party conſtantly frequent the Preſbyterian Churches all along in the late times, and yet they did not think thoſe mens Orders to be good who officiated, that took them not from the Biſhop.*

As to the Perſecutions and Cruelties of our Adverſaries, they were much to blame for them, but as it was done from a Law of the State Civil, and not from

the

the Church, ſo I ſuppoſe you do beleive with me that Religion forceth no mans will and Nature, and that there may be as great villains imbrace a true Religion, as there be that do a falſe, ſo that nothing can be concluded from thence.

If I have ſaid in my Compendium ſent you, that Mr. Acton aſſerted our Saviours way in making Prieſts was defective, I did then much bely him, for he ſaid no ſuch thing, and I am confident, Sir, you are much miſtaken, that any ſuch thing ſhould be in that Paper.

I ſhall be always ready to hear whatever reaſons you ſhall be pleaſed to offer and do think none can do more than your ſelf, for which I ſhall alſo think my ſelf much obliged that ever ſhall be

S I R,

Nov. 28. 1687. *Your moſt Humble Servant,*

A. N.

Both which Letters came to me in the time of our Audit, when I was totally engaged in a work of another nature, in paſſing my accounts as Treaſurer and Receiver of our Church for the foregoing year, however notwithſtanding the hurry this put me in all day, that one that ſtill owned himſelf to be of our Communion might not want that ſatisfaction which he pretended to deſire, I made a ſhift to ſteal ſo much time from my ſleep at night as to write him this following anſwer.

S I R,

LAST Fryday having ſent you my ſecond Paper in order to your further ſatisfaction about the point propoſed, I did at the ſame time receive another from you, containing your Animadverſions upon my firſt, wherein I find the main objection that ſticks with you is that in our old Ordinal The Form uſed in Prieſtly ordination is ſo defective as not to be ſufficient to conferre the office, ſo that through this defect all that have been Ordained by that Ordinal, and all ſuch as have ſince derived their orders from them ſo ordained are in reality and truth no Prieſts, and all this only for want of the word Prieſt in the Form of Ordination. Which objection I thought I had ſufficiently prevented by telling you in my firſt Paper, that though the word Prieſt vvas vvanting in the Form, yet the vvhole of his office vvas expreſſed therein, and that muſt be allovved to be ſufficient even by the Papiſts themſelves, ſince in their Ordinal it is never as much as once mentioned in all thoſe many Forms, vvhich the Biſhop ſpeaks over the Perſon ordained, vvhen he confers the office upon him. And therefore if it be ſufficient in their Ordinal to expreſs the ſumm of the Prieſtly office vvithout naming the vvord

by

by which it is called, I know not why it may not alſo be allowed to be ſufficient in ours. But it ſeems you are not ſatisfied that the ſumm of the Prieſtly office is expreſſed in the Form of our Ordinal: whereby a Prieſt is ordained, and you bring ſeveral reaſons to the contrary. The buſineſs which I told you in my laſt I am now engaged in will not permit me at preſent to give you a full Anſwer to all you object, but I having an obligation upon me from another occaſion to examine this to the bottom do now only deſire your patience awhile, and all that I have to ſay on this point ſhall be communicated unto you. In the interim I have theſe following particulars to obſerve upon the Paper you ſent me.

Firſt, You much miſtake what I mention in reference to the *Preſbyterians*, if you pleaſe to conſult my Paper again you will find nothing concerning their being in Commiſſion with our Church at the Review of our Liturgy. For the thing is by no means true, the Liturgy having been reviewed in Convocation, where the *Preſbyterians* had nothing to do. There was indeed a meeting at the *Savoy* in order to bring things to a compoſure, but nothing that I ſaid in my Paper was intended by me to have the leaſt reference thereto, and I wonder how my words could be wreſted to it. All that I meant by what I ſaid in reference to them (and this I thought I had expreſſed plainly enough to be underſtood) was that in their Cavils and Objections in the late times againſt Epiſcopacy and the ſuperiority of the Epiſcopal office above the Prieſtly they drew one Argument againſt us from our own Ordinal, ſuch as they call *Argumentum ad Homines*, and from the very Form whereby our Biſhops are ordained endeavour to prove upon us, that they have nothing in their office which is not alſo contained in the office of a Prieſt, The Form of their Ordination expreſſing nothing (as they urg'd) which doth not belong to a Prieſt as well as a Biſhop even according to our own definition of the Prieſtly office. And to take away the foundation of his Argument (as I have been told) thoſe words were put into the Forms as might expreſs a more explicit and clear diſtinction between the two Functions. And although I do not much inſiſt hereon (the thing not being at all material to the controverſie in hand) yet I have reaſons that perſwade me I have not been mis-informed. For the Papiſt at that time was an adverſary not at all thought on. The Church had then juſt recovered it ſelf from that many years oppreſſion which it had ſuffered from the *Preſbyterians*, and therefore had their thoughts at that time totally ſet how to fence themſelves againſt the enemy that laſt hurt them without having any ſuch reguard to the other Adverſary, at that time low enough and not at all formidable. But whether this were ſo or no ſure I am the two Pamphlets you mention *Eraſtus* Senior, and *Eraſtus* Junior could have no influence in that matter. For *Eraſtus* Senior (and which of the two I ſuppoſe by the Title was firſt Printed) makes mention (*Page the laſt*) of this alteration in our Ordinal then already made, and although he ſays it was done

done after the Printing of that Book, yet certainly it muſt be before the Publiſhing of it, otherwiſe how could mention hereof be made therein. But whenſoever they were Printed or Publiſhed, they were ſo far from being in the leaſt likely to influence ſo grave and learned an Aſſembly, as that of the Church of *England* Aſſembled in Convocation by any thing written in them, that they were conſiderable for nothing as much as the contempt which they met with from all ſorts of people as ſcandalous and idle pamphlets, and ſo they were Reputed among ſome of the ſobereſt of the Papiſts themſelves as having no grounds for what they went upon but unreaſonable calumnies, falſe ſuggeſtions and deceitful argumentations, which ſo far moved the indignation of a learned Prieſt of that Religion, that he thought himſelf concerned to diſown the whole that was contained in thoſe Pamphlets by Writing a Book againſt them.

Secondly, Whereas you lay much ſtreſs upon the imperative words uſed by the Biſhop at the impoſition of hands, and will have them to be of the eſſentials of Ordination; and challenge me to ſhow when the Church of *Rome* ever made any ſuch alterations in them as we have done, in anſwer hereto I lay down theſe following particulars.

1. That thoſe words are no more eſſential to Ordination, then any other part of the Ordinal. Had thoſe words indeed been injoyned by Chriſt, and commanded by him to be always uſed in Ordination, then I muſt confeſs the altering of them would have been a very criminal deviation from our Saviours inſtitution, and might inferre a nullity in the whole Adminiſtration. But the Church of *Rome* doth not pretend to any ſuch divine Authority for any of their Forms, but it is at preſent their moſt generally received Doctrine that the very Form of Ordination as well as the preliminary and concomitant prayers (which you allow alterable) are in the power of the Church to alter, add and new word them as they ſhall judge moſt convenient, and if the Church of *Rome* hath this liberty, I know not why the Church of *England* may not be allowed to have it alſo.

2. Thoſe imperative words in which you place the eſſence of Ordination are ſo far from being thus eſſential thereto, that for above a thouſand years the Church of *Rome* it ſelf never had any ſuch in any of their Ordinals, as may appear from the Collection *Morinus* hath made of them in his Book *de Ordinationibus*. But the whole Rite of Ordination for all that time was performed by impoſition of hands and prayer only, without any ſuch imperative words at all ſpoken by the Ordainer to the perſon Ordained to denote his receiving the office conferred on him, as is now made uſe of both in ours as well as in the Roman Ordinal. And the Council of *Carthage* which is the ancienteſt we find to have directed concerning this matter preſcribes nothing herein, but impoſition of hands and prayer only. And in the Book of *Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy* aſcribed to *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, and believed by many of the Romiſh

Romiſh Communion to be genuine, and by all to be very ancient mention is made of impoſition of hands and prayer as the only things made uſe of in Ordination. And if you will go to the Scriptures, you will find the Holy Apoſtles made uſe of nothing elſe in the Ordination of the ſeven Deacons, and when *Paul* and *Barnabas* were ſet a part by the Commandment of the Holy Ghoſt to go preach the Goſpel to the Gentiles we find mention of nothing elſe done in their deſignation to that Miniſtry. And therefore *Morinus* a Prieſt of the Church of *Rome* lays down this Doctrine, that nothing is abſolutely neceſſary to Ordination but impoſition of hands with a convenient prayer, for this only (he ſaith) the Scripture hath delivered and the univerſal practice of the Church hath confirm'd. But I having promiſed you a fuller Examination of this point ſhall at preſent no longer detain you, only thus much I could not but obſerve unto you at preſent to let you ſee how miſerably you are impoſed on by ſuch as would make thoſe things eſſential to Ordination, which if granted will inferre a nullity not only in our Orders, but alſo in all the Orders of all that have been Ordained in the Church of Chriſt for above a thouſand years after his firſt eſtabliſhing of it here on Earth, and conſequently alſo make their own Orders null and void which have been derived from them.

Thirdly, You grant that theſe words in the Roman Ordinal [*Receive power to offer ſacrifice to God and to celebrate Maſs both for the Living and the Dead*] are a novel addition and by no means eſſential to Orders, but only words of inſtruction to let them know that are Ordained what power they had received by that Prieſtly office, which afore they were in expreſs words inveſted with, and for what purpoſe they were to make uſe of it. In Anſwer to which I ſhall lay down theſe following particulars,

1. That in granting this you grant the whole point in controverſie between us and the Church of *Rome* concerning this matter. For whatſoever they may tell you about altering the Form in our Ordinal, all this is impertinent cavil made uſe of only to deceive the leſs wary and inſnare the ignorant. The only point which they will inſiſt upon when they come to diſpute this matter in earneſt is, that by our Ordinal we do not give our Prieſts the povver of offering up the ſacrifice of the Maſs. For they ſay that in the office of a Prieſt are contained tvvo povvers, the povver of Sacrificing, and the povver of Abſolving from Sin, and that this tvvofold povver is conferred by a tvvofold Matter and Form in Ordination. That in conferring the firſt povver the delivering of the Sacred Veſſels is the matter, and theſe vvords [*Receive power to offer Sacrifice to God*, &c.] are the Form, and in conferring the ſecond povver impoſition of hands is the matter, and theſe vvords [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt whoſe ſins thou doſt forgive*, &c.] the Form. And therefore judging both theſe povvers eſſentially and indiviſibly contained in the office of a Prieſt, and that both theſe Rites the firſt by the Authority of the Council of *Florence*,

and

and the ſecond by the Authority of the Council of *Trent*, are eſſentially neceſſary to the conferring theſe Powers, do for this reaſon deny the validity of our Orders, becauſe in our Ordinations we only make uſe of the latter matter and form, and totally omit the former; and therefore (ſay they) we have not the whole power of Prieſthood conferred on us, but only that of remitting ſins as your Paper mentions, and on this account the other part of offering Sacrifice, which is the main eſſential, (as they ſay) being wanting all becomes null and void for lack thereof: And this is the plain ſtate of the Controverſie between us, and therefore if you are convinced by what I wrote you in my firſt Paper that thoſe words [*Receive power to offer Sacrifice to God, and to Celebrate Maſs both for the Living and the Dead*] are not neceſſary in Ordination, becauſe in ſo many Ages never uſed in the Church (as can be undeniably prov'd they were not) you have conquer'd the whole Objection that is in earneſt made againſt our Orders, and the Controverſie is at an end between us. For Secondly, That which you ſay that all Prieſtly power, and conſequently this power of Sacrificing is given in the *Roman* Ordinal in other words before the ſpeaking of theſe [*Receive thou power to offer Sacrifice*, &c] will appear by examining the Ordinal it ſelf to be altogether a miſtake. For if this be given, it muſt be done either in the Prayers of the Office, or in the Imperative words ſpoken by the Biſhop to the perſon Ordained. In the Prayers you will not ſay, for then the Prayers in our Ordinal muſt be allowed to be as valid for this purpoſe alſo, in which the Prieſtly Office is as fully expreſſed both by Name and Deſcription as in theirs. And in the Imperative words you cannot ſay it: For there are but two Forms of Imperative words in the *Roman* Ordinal before this, [*Receive Power to offer Sacrifice*, &c.] and both ſpoken by the Biſhop at the Veſting of the perſon to be Ordained with the Prieſtly Veſtments. For in the putting on the firſt ſort of thoſe Veſtments, he ſays, [*Receive thou the yoke of the Lord, for his yoke is ſweet, and his burden light*] and then immediately after at the putting on of another ſort of Veſtment, he ſays, [*Receive thou the Prieſtly Garment by which Charity is underſtood, for God is able to encreaſe unto thee Charity, and every perfect Work*]. But by neither of theſe any thing of Prieſtly Power is given, or do any of that Communion ever ſay ſo, and therefore according to your own conceſſion it muſt follow (and it is that which the Learnedeſt of the *Roman* Communion ſay) that the laſt imperative words in the *Roman* Ordinal, which are ſpoken at the laſt impoſition of hands, [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins thou doſt forgive they are forgiven, and whoſe ſins thou doſt retain they are retained*] are the alone eſſential Form, whereby the Orders of Prieſthood are conferred in that Church, and this Form we had in our firſt Ordinal, as well as they in theirs, and much more fully, becauſe therein are alſo ſubjoyned theſe words, [*And be thou a faithful diſpencer of the Word of God, and of his Sacraments, in the Name of the Father, and of the*

Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt,] which are wanting in the *Roman* Ordinal, which are not any ſuch notorious and idle Tautologies as you are pleaſed to call them. For although they expreſs nothing more then what is comprehended in the foregoing words, [*Whoſe ſins thou doſt forgive*, &c.] yet they are explanator of them, and do more explicitly tell us what is contained in them. For a Prieſt doth no otherwiſe remit our ſins in the Church of Chriſt then as he adminiſters to us the means in order thereto in the Word and Sacraments, and the concomitant Offices belonging thereto.

Fourthly, I further obſerve in your Paper that you quote Mr. *Fox* to prove that thoſe who were ordained by King *Edwards* Ordinal were ordained again in Queen *Maries* Reign. I muſt confeſs Mr. *Foxes* Book is too large for any one ſo throughly to know every particular of it, as poſitively to deny what you ſay to be contained in it. But when you convince me of this, and ſhow me in Mr. *Fox* where any ſuch thing is ſaid, then will I believe that Dr. *Burnet* hath dealt falſly with us by telling us the contrary in his *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, Part II. Page 289. But be it ſo or be it not ſo the cauſe doth not at all depend hereupon.

Fifthly, You infer the nullity of our Orders, becauſe in the conferring of them no power is given to Conſecrate the Euchariſt. To this I anſwer, that the words of our Ordinal giving power to Adminiſter the Sacraments, give power alſo to Conſecrate the Elements in the Holy Euchariſt, and in all ſuch Forms the more general the words are it is always the better, provided they are ſuch as include all the particulars, as it is certain the words of our Form in the Ordination of a Prieſt, include all the particulars that belong to that Office. But if you urge that it is not only neceſſary to expreſs the power of Adminiſtring the Sacraments in general, but that it muſt alſo be done in particular; I muſt then ask the queſtion, why the Sacrament of Baptiſm ought not alſo in particular to be mentioned in the Form as well as the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, and why may we not from the omiſſion of this in the *Roman* Ordinal infer the nullity of their Orders as well as they the nullity of ours from the omiſſion of the other, and that eſpecially ſince the Sacrament of Baptiſm may be juſtly eſteemed the nobler of the two, as being that which firſt gives us Life in Chriſt, whereas the other only adds Strength and Nouriſhment thereto. But here you will object to what I have ſaid, that our Ordinal gives power only to diſpence the Sacraments, and not to conſecrate the Euchariſt. To this I anſwer, that by the word diſpence the Church means the whole of what belongs both to the Conſecration and Adminiſtration of that Sacred Rite; and words are alwaies to be underſtood according to the meaning and receiv'd interpretation of them that uſe them, and not as they ſhall be limited or forced by the impertinent cavils of every contentious Adverſary; and you may always take this for a certain Rule, that when in the management of Controverſie men come to cavil about words, it is an evident

ſign

ſign that they are run on ground as to all things elſe. But to this point you further ſay, that thoſe that have Authority only thus to diſpence the Elements, have not power to make preſent the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Holy Euchariſt, without which you hold this Sacrament cannot be adminiſtred. To this I anſwer, that if by making preſent the Body and Blood of Chriſt, you mean a Corporeal preſence by the tranſmutation of the Elements, as the Church of *Rome* holds, it is a monſtrous opinion, which we can never receive, and I hope you are not gone ſo far as to ſwallow with them ſo abſurd an opinion.

Sixthly, You ſay Chriſt made his Apoſtles Prieſts when he ſaid unto them, *Do this in remembrance of me*, and that you take this clearly to be the ſenſe of the Church. If you mean by the Church the Church of *Rome*, I acknowledge what you ſay to be true, they having ſo defined it in the Council of *Trent*; but that the Church of *England* ever held this I utterly deny; for it is a Doctrine peculiar to the Church of *Rome*, and but of late date among them, being firſt invented by ſome of the Schoolmen to ſerve a turn: For about Six Hundred Years ſince, and not ſooner, the Church of *Rome* taking up that moſt Sacrilegious practice of denying the Cup to the Laiety, and being afterwards preſſed with the inſtitution of our Saviour, who commanded the Adminiſtration to be in both Kinds; to evade this they framed this ſubtle invention of ſaying that Chriſt in the inſtitution of this Holy Sacrament made his Apoſtles Prieſts, by ſaying unto them, *Do this in remembrance of me*, and that therefore the Commandement given them of Communicating in both Kinds belongs to them only as Prieſts, and that the Laiety from this Commandment can claim no right thereto. But this is a fetch which ſome of the wiſeſt and ableſt Men among them are aſhamed of; and it is particularly diſowned by *Eſtius*, *Suarez* and *Chriſtophorus a Caſtro*, as being neither agreeable to the Antients, nor of any ſolidity in it ſelf.

Seventhly, You allow our Form of Epiſcopal Ordination to be ſufficiently perfect, which if granted will infer the Ordination of Arch-Biſhop *Parker*, and all the other Biſhops in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeths* Reign to be good and valid, which is a thing our Adverſaries will never yet grant us. For you ſay that a Biſhop at his Ordination doth not receive any new Character, but hath only the ſame Power and Character which he had before as a Prieſt further extended in him; and it is well known that Arch-Biſhop *Parker*, and moſt of the others that were made Biſhops in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeths* Reign, if not all, (for I will not be poſitive in a thing where I am not certain) were made Prieſts by the *Roman* Ordinal, and therefore if the words of our Form be ſufficient to extend the Character and Power of a Prieſt (as you phraſe it) to the Office of Epiſcopacy, thoſe that you will allow to have been before good Prieſts, you muſt alſo allow to have been made good Biſhops by our Form. But here I muſt beg leave to tell you, that our Church

holds a Biſhop to be as much eſſentially diſtinct from a Prieſt, as a Prieſt is from a Deacon: For that which makes the diſtinction of Orders is the diſtinct Powers which belong unto them. For as a Prieſt hath a diſtinct Power from a Deacon which makes his Office to be eſſentially diſtinct from the Office of the other, ſo hath a Biſhop alſo a diſtinct Power from a Prieſt, which makes his Office eſſentially diſtinct from the Office of Prieſthood, that is, the Power of Ordaining, which a Prieſt hath not, and this you muſt allow, or elſe fall in with the opinion of the Presbyterians, and grant that a Prieſt hath as much power to Ordain as a Biſhop.

And this is all which at preſent I ſhall think fit to take notice of in your Anſwer to my firſt Paper. I have now alſo by me your Anſwer to my ſecond Paper, and muſt beg your pardon, that my Buſineſs this Week hath been ſuch at our Audit, (as you well know) that I could not have leaſure ſooner to ſend you a Reply. For as I take it very kindly of you that you will apply to me concerning any doubt, which you may have as to your Religion, ſo ſhall I think my ſelf obliged to do all that lyes in me for your ſatisfaction. And as to your Anſwer to my ſecond Paper, nothing is more eaſie than to ſhow you how much you have been impoſed on by them which tell you thoſe things you write me therein. As to Biſhop *Ridleys* Conſecration by the Popiſh Ordinal, I thought I had given you demonſtration for that by ſhowing unto you in the laſt Paper that I ſent you, that Biſhop *Ridley* was Conſecrated, as it appears by the Arch-Biſhop of *Canterburies* Regiſter, *Sept. 5th. Anno Dom.* 1547. in the Firſt Year of King *Edwards* Reign, whereas it is evident by the publick Records of the Kingdom, that the Act of Parliament which preſcribed the making of the New Ordinal was not Enacted till *February* 1. *Anno Dom.* 1549. in the Fourth Year of King *Edwards* Reign, and concerning this you may receive ſatisfaction by conſulting *Kebles* Collection of the Statutes of this Kingdom, *Pag.* 674. at the top of the Page. But you urge againſt this Mr. *Maſons* and Dr. *Burnets* Authority, who (you tell me,) ſay the contrary. But that you may ſee how much you are abuſed by thoſe who impoſe on you ſuch things; I will ſet down in words at length what both theſe Authors ſay as to this matter: And firſt Mr. *Maſons* words are *Page* 209. at the bottom of the page, as followeth; "*Primo* "*leges de antiquis Ordinalibus abrogandis, & de novis ſtabiliendis latæ ſunt* "*Annis* Edwardi *Tertio & Quarto, ut paret ex Statutis*; Ridleius *autem* "*Primo* Edwardi, Ferrarus *ejuſdem Regni anno ſecundo eſt ſacratus, uterque* "*ante veterum Ordinalium abdicationem, & per conſequens uterq; ſecundum* "*veſtram Formam*; *i. e.* The Statute for abrogating the Old Ordinal and "making a New was firſt Enacted in the Third and Fourth of *Edward* the "Sixth, as is apparent from the Statute Book; but *Ridley* was Conſecrated "the Firſt Year of King *Edwards* Reign, and *Ferrar* in the Second Year, "both before the abrogating of the Old Ordinal, and by conſequence both

"accord-

" according to your Form. So far Mr. *Maſon*, and as to Dr. *Burnet* if you pleaſe to conſult him in his Second Part of his Hiſtory of the Reformation, *Page* 290. you will there find him ſaying theſe words; " So they did not " eſteem *Hooper* and *Ridley* Biſhops, and therefore only degraded them from " Prieſthood, though they had been Ordained by their own Forms, ſaving only the Oath to the Pope. And this I hope will fully convince you that I have told you nothing but truth in this matter, and that you have been moſt groſly abuſed by thoſe that have informed you the contrary.

As to what you ſay concerning evil mens being of the true Religion, you very much miſtake my meaning, if you think that I did infer in mine the illneſs of the Popiſh Religion from the ill actions of thoſe that profeſſed it; for to do this would be to argue againſt all Religion, there being abundance of wicked men of all Religions whatever; and all Arguments of this nature are very fooliſh, unleſs the ſins and iniquities of ſuch men as we find fault with proceed from the allowed Doctrines of the Church, of which they are; and on this account I muſt tell you, I think the Romiſh Church abundantly culpable. But this was not at all the thing I referred to in telling you of their Cruelties and Perſecutions againſt us, but only to let you know that then they were in ſuch a rage againſt us, that all they did in reference to the diſallowing of our Orders may very well be conſtrued rather to proceed from the violence of that alone, then any rational judgment which they made of this matter, it being a thing very uſual between contending parties, for men to be carried ſo high in their animoſities, as rather to act by their Paſſions then their Reaſon in what they do and alledge againſt each other. And this I take to be the caſe of the Church of *Rome* in moſt of its proceedings with us, but in none more manifeſtly then in the denying of the validity of our Orders, which even according to their own Doctrines and poſitions are more defenſible then thoſe which even they themſelves adminiſter by their own Ordinal. As to other things in your two Letters which I have omitted to ſpeak to, they are either ſuch as need not an anſwer, or elſe ſuch as I ſhall more fully examine on the other occaſion which I have mentioned, and therefore at preſent have nothing more to add, but my moſt hearty prayers to Almighty God, that he would be pleaſed ſo to direct and aſſiſt you in your inquiſitions concerning this matter, that after having fully tryed it, you may hold faſt that which is good. I am

SIR,

Thurſday, *Dec.* 1. 1687. *Your moſt Affectionate Friend*
H. Prideaux.

On my having concluded this Letter to Mr. *Norris* I received another from him, retracting what he ſaid in his laſt; it is as followeth;

SIR,

SIR,

WHat in my laſt I appealed to Dr. *Burnet* for is in part a miſtake, who doth not own Biſhop *Ridley* to be made by the New Ordinal, though made Biſhop in *Edward* the Sixths time, but he expreſly ſays, that though it doth not appear, that they reordained any made in his time at the beginning of Queen *Maries*, yet afterward in her time they diſowned any Orders to be valid given by the New Ordinal. To me there is no queſtion at all, but that the Commiſſioners in Queen *Maries* days, who refuſed to degrade him of his Epiſcopal Office when they did him of his Prieſtly, did look upon him as made ſuch by the new Ordinal, becauſe being made Biſhop in K. *Edward* the ſixth's time when the new Ordinal was compoſed might reaſonably take it for granted.

But the main Queſtion to the purpoſe is this and which our ſide took upon them to prove, that our orders were good and valid, becauſe ſuch who were made by that Ordinal were owned and approved to be good by the Romaniſts. When I find any inſtances given that they were ſo owned and approved of by them, that I confeſs will be a great point gained to the determining of the Controverſie, Sir, I am

Your Moſt Humble Servant,

Anthony Norris.

In Anſwer to which Letter I added this following Poſtſcript to my laſt above-written.

HAving concluded this Letter, and being on delivering of it to be Tranſcribed for you, I received another from you, acknowledging your error as to what you quoted Dr. Burnet *for, in reference to the Ordinal by which Biſhop* Ridley *was Conſecrated. And ſince you now grant that point that he was Conſecrated by the* Roman *Ordinal, you muſt allow that it was without any reaſon that the Papiſts in Queen* Maries *time would not allow him to be a Biſhop (for their refuſing to allow him becauſe they thought he had been Conſecrated by the New Ordinal, which you ſuggeſt is a miſtake, which within ſo ſhort a compaſs of time they could not poſſibly be guilty of) and this may be ſufficient to make any impartial man ſuſpect that all their other proceedings with us in this matter are without reaſon alſo, and to have riſen from nothing elſe but the violence of their paſſion, which will not permit them to allow us any thing, whom they account Hereticks and Schiſmaticks from their Church, that may make either for our cauſe or our reputation. And whereas you call upon me to make out Mr.* E's *Argument that our Orders were allowed good in Queen* Maries *time, although I*

do

do not think it lyes upon me to make good whatſoever another man may ſay in this matter, yet I will deal as freely with you as you deſire, and therefore muſt tell you that from the Hiſtories of thoſe times, as far as I have been converſant in them, it appears to me that none that were Ordained by the New Ordinal were reordained in Queen Maries *days, but only had thoſe things ſupplyed to them from the* Roman *Ordinal, which were left out in ours, that is, the delivery of the Sacred Veſſels with theſe words,* [Receive power to offer Sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Maſs for the Living and the Dead] *and this you allowing not to be eſſential to Orders, the admitting of our Prieſts to officiate, by doing this only to them, ſufficiently proves they had the whole eſſence of Orders before. But I have told you before whether this be ſo or not ſo, the Controverſie doth not at all depend hereupon : For if all muſt be conceded that an Adverſary ſhall think fit to deny, this would put a very ſpeedy end to all Controverſie, and nothing elſe would be requir'd to carry the Cauſe, but for a man ſtoutly to deny whatſoever his Adverſary may claim unto himſelf. I muſt alſo here take notice unto you that Mr.* Acton's *proceedings with Mr.* Earbury *were in my judgment very unreaſonable, and Mr.* Earbury *was too eaſie in yielding to him therein. For both by your Paper as well as by that Mr.* Earbury *brought me, it appears, that Mr.* Acton *required it of Mr.* Earbury *to make good our Orders, and put him upon the proving part herein ; whereas in reality his buſineſs was to be only on the defenſive. Our Orders have now been uſed in our Church, and received among us as good and valid for near One Hundred and Fifty Years, if they muſt now be rejected as null and void, let them that will have it ſo produce their Reaſons, and if we are able to Anſwer theſe it is all that can be required of us in this matter, and therefore let Mr.* Acton, *or any of his Brethren, bring ſuch Reaſons againſt our Orders, or alledge ſuch defects for their nullity as we cannot Anſwer, and then I will plainly grant the Cauſe is theirs as to this Point.*

This Poſtſcript together with the Letter to which it was annex'd being ſent to Mr. *Norris*, and alſo a Meſſage therewith to deſire him to lend me his *Eraſtus* Junior, it being a Book I had never ſeen : He returned me this following Letter.

SIR,

I Have but now ſeriouſly peruſed over your laſt Paper, which will never have the effect upon me that you deſign, unleſs I can find that Mr. *Acton* cannot Anſwer it. Now as I have heard him ſay he will challenge no man, ſo alſo that he will refuſe none that ſhall challenge him, nor will he meddle with any thing which relates not unto him ; but if it does, he will then be concerned in it. So that *Sir*, if you ſhall pleaſe to write me a Line or two, ordering me to get Mr. *Acton* to Anſwer it, he will then be obliged to undertake

take it, which will be the only way of giving me the beſt ſatisfaction which you ſeem to be zealous in, and for which I ſhall ever look upon my ſelf,

S I R,

Dec. 8. 1687. *Your moſt Obliged Humble Servant,*

Anthony Norris.

Sir, I have neither of both the *Eraſtus's* now, although about three Months ſince I read them over.

To which Letter I ſent this following Anſwer the next day after I received it.

S I R,

I Have received yours in Anſwer to the laſt I ſent you, wherein you tell me that what I have wrote therein ſhall never have that effect upon you which I deſign, unleſs you find that Mr. *Acton* cannot Anſwer it; and becauſe Mr. *Acton* tells you, that he will challenge no man, or at all meddle with any thing, but where concerned, unleſs challenged to it; you perſwade me to challenge him to Anſwer my Paper ſent you, that ſo he may be unavoidably engaged (as you think) to enter the Liſt with me on this point, and then according as he or I ſhall prevail in your judgment, ſo you ſeem reſolved to make choice of your Religion, either the one way or the other. To which I Anſwer, as to the deſign you mention, I have none other upon you, but to ſerve you in giving you the ſatisfaction you applyed to me for in the point propoſed; but if you are afore reſolv'd right or wrong, that nothing ſhall have any effect upon you in order hereunto, I cannot help that. If this be your mind (as any one may well ſuſpect from your laſt to me) you would have done well to have ſpared me all this Trouble, and taken your own Courſe. As to Mr. *Acton* I have nothing to do with him, or he with me. You were pleaſed to ſend me your Doubts, and to deſire me to give you ſatisfaction in them, and according to your requeſt I have endeavoured it to the beſt of my power, and to that intent have been at the pains to write you ſeveral Papers, and if I have not in them fully cleared to you all thoſe things you ſcruple, you may be pleaſed to ſhow me where the defect is, and I ſhall readily ſupply it by a further Examination thereof unto you. But if you have nothing of this further to ſay unto me, or any Objections at all to make againſt the Anſwers I have ſent unto you, it is reaſonable to expect that you ſhould reſt ſatisfied, and give me no further trouble. As to the project of challenging, which you propoſe, I muſt beg your pardon that I think it a

method

method by no means proper for me to purſue; for I know not into what ſnare this may lead me, or how far ſuch an action of mine may be interpreted to do me a miſchief; and beſides it is a courſe altogether improper to the matter in hand. For although you ſhould have a Title to your Eſtate as good as can be given you, yet I ſuppoſe you vvould not think this a ſufficient reaſon for you to challenge any man to diſpute it at Lavv vvith you, but vvould hold the poſſeſſion vvithout giving your ſelf any further trouble till there comes an aſſailant to diſturb you. And our Caſe is exactly the ſame. We have all the Orders which were firſt inſtituted in the Church of Chriſt legally and rightly conveyed to us, and we claim to hold them upon as good a Title as any Chriſtian Church in the World; and being thus in poſſeſſion it is not our part to challenge any one to diſpute this with us; but the very nature of the thing puts us totally upon the defenſive, and I ſhall not act any other part in this matter. If Mr. *Acton*, or any of his Brethren think our Poſſeſſion wrong, and our Title falſe, it is their part to be the Challengers, and we no otherwiſe concerned then to appear as Defendants, and put in our Anſwer to their Plea againſt us: And therefore if you are ſo earneſt to have this point diſputed, you muſt go unto our Adverſaries for a Challenger, and if you can find any one among them, that will take this part upon him in the point propoſed, let him lay all his Arguments together, all that *Eraſtus* Sen. or *Eraſtus* Jun. can furniſh him with, and as many elſe as he can get, and let him urge them with all the Art and Skill he can, and be he Mr. *Acton*, or be he Mr. *Webſter*, or be he any one elſe of the moſt able Champions of that Communion, I will give him an Anſwer in Print. And this is all I have to ſay to you in this matter, and if you have any thing further to ſay to me you may be pleaſed to take your Liberty; only next Week I ſhall be conſtantly imployed in another matter, which will not permit me to attend any thing elſe, and therefore for ſo long muſt beg your reſpit; and I am

SIR,

Dec. 9. 1687. *Your affectionate Friend*,

Humphrey Prideaux.

About ſix days after I ſent this, I received from him this following Anſwer to my former, bearing date *Dec.* 14. 1687.

SIR,

YOur not complying to what I deſir'd, which I told you would be the beſt expedient for my ſatisfaction to been debated with Mr. *Acton*, hath put me alone upon undertaking to give you my thoughts upon your laſt Paper.

As to your cautions of being impoſed upon by the Adverſary, I ſee no reaſon for to conclude it; beſides I would have thoſe who think me ſo to be, to take notice, that I am above one and twenty years of Age, and though I be no Schollar nor Linguiſt, it may be I have ſeen the World as much as ſome that be, whatever Dr. *Brevint* has ſaid of them in his Witch of *Endor*, I never found any thing from them of what he reports, but ever found them very modeſt, fair and candid, although they have been very good Schollars; neither ſhall I on the other ſide embrace any thing againſt my Reaſon and Judgment to avoid the imputation of being ignorant and unwary.

I have view'd over your firſt Paper again, and cannot find my ſelf to be miſtaken therein, where you plainly ſay, that the *Preſbyterians* objected that in the Ordinal there was no difference between a Biſhop and a Prieſt, becauſe their Offices were not at all diſtinguiſhed in the words, by which they were conferred on them when Ordained, and then to obviate the above-mentioned cavil of the Presbyterians the explicatory words were inſerted: Which Objection being the ſame with the Papiſts, and the Presbyterians never induring the words Biſhop or Prieſt, the inſerting of them could not be to remove the cavils of the Presbyterians, but muſt neceſſarily be for thoſe of the Papiſts; beſides as to what further you ſay, that the Presbyterians vindicated their Form from hence to be as good as ours, when as it is well known, that they uſed no Form at all, but what was *ex tempore*, which I have ſeen them my ſelf when they have Ordained, that their prayers have been all *ex tempore*; and ſo far were they from vindicating their Ordinal by being conformable unto ours, that they looked upon ours to be ſo highly Idolatrous, that in the late times I ſee them make Bonfires of them, with the Common-Prayer Books; and though the Papiſts were inconſiderable for number, yet I know the Church of *England* look'd upon them all along to be more formidable than all the Sects together in point of weight.

I have alſo now again view'd over both the *Eraſtus's*, and eſpecially that Page which you quoted, and cannot find any mention made in any part of them that hint any thing of the alteration of our Ordinal, and therefore might be publiſhed before that alteration, which you ſay could not be, which doth alſo further appear they were by the dates of their publiſhing. And as for thoſe ſober Papiſts which you tell me exploded them at their coming out; when I ſee it in Print from them, I may be then Sir of your mind; and alſo that it is the receiv'd Doctrine of the Romaniſts, that the very eſſential Form of Ordination is in the power of the Church to alter, of which you have not yet given me the leaſt proof, and you know ours is in that very part of it.

And though *Morinus* ſhould have obſerved that for One Thouſand Years that the Imperative, *be thou a Prieſt*, was not uſed in their Ordinals, yet he doth not ſay it did not expreſly give all Prieſtly power in other words, or by

by equivalency, by giving full power to perform all the Offices of it, which Sir I told you ours did not ; and that it did not give power to Conſecrate, and make preſent the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Sacrament, not by way of Tranſubſtantiation I meant, but only in the ſence and words of our own Church, that is, verily and indeed ; which is more than to be preſent only by a meer Figure, or to be only Commemorative. And although he further tell us, that the whole Rite was performed by Prayers and impoſition of hands : This doth no way exclude the other which I ſaid before ; for when St. *Paul* minded *Timothy* to ſtir up the gift given him by impoſition of hands, he named nothing elſe but impoſition of hands ; yet can any think there was not alſo Prayers, and a form of words uſed at the laying of hands upon him.

And whereas Sir you ſay the Council of *Carthage*, which is the Antienteſt hath directed concerning this matter, preſcribes herein nothing but impoſition of hands and prayers only : You ſhould Sir have given me the very words of that Councel, whereby I might have ſeen whether any ſuch thing could have been inferred from them ; and ſince you were not pleaſed to recite them, I will take upon me to do them for you, which words are theſe ; *When a Prieſt is Ordained, the Biſhop bleſſing him and laying his hands upon his head, all the Prieſts that are preſent ſhall likewiſe lay their hands upon his head about the Biſhops hand.* Doth this Canon prove any thing more than that it is a command only for the Prieſts then preſent to lay their hands alſo upon the head of the perſon Ordained about the Biſhops hand at the ſame time he bleſs him, and lay his hand upon him : This doth no way ſhew us what the Ordinal of the Church was in thoſe dayes : This Canon had been proper to have been offered in caſe any had denyed impoſition of hands, which being required, doth it therefore follow nothing elſe was eſſential, becauſe the reſt of the Prieſts preſent were required alſo to do it with the Biſhop? If a learned Papiſt ſhould have offered me ſuch an Argument or Authority as this, I might then have concluded Sir with your ſelf, that I thought him about to impoſe upon me.

I will alſo tell you the words of *Dioniſius*, whom you quote, but not recite ; *That the Prieſt who was to be Ordained kneeled before the Biſhop, who laid his hand on his head, and did Conſecrate him with an Holy Prayer, and then marked him with the ſign of the Croſs, and the Biſhop, and the reſt of the Clergy then preſent gave him the Kiſs of Peace.* Although he mentions all theſe, yet where doth he ſay that theſe were the only things, as you were pleaſed to ſay he ſaid they were. Can any one rationally conclude from this, that there was no form of words uſed when the Biſhop laid his hand upon the Ordained ; or that he ſhould then ſay nothing ; it muſt be thought at the leaſt that at that very time he uſed ſuch a Prayer, in which might be contained the very eſſential Form, for any thing that *Dioniſius* hath to the contrary. And

now Sir give me leave to mind you of this diſtinction, for the better underſtanding my meaning in what I have formerly ſaid, and ſhall have occaſion hereafter to mention : That where the eſſential Form, or any part of it be contained in the Prayers, Prayers and Impoſition of hands is all that is neceſſary; but the Prayers of the *Roman* Ordinal have the eſſential Form contained in them, which in ours is not, therefore with us, Prayers and Impoſition of hands are not ſufficient, though they may be with them. And this is my Anſwer to what elſe you quote from *Morinus de Ordinationibus* ; and alſo to that of the ſeven Deacons and Diſciples, which you ſay were made ſuch only by impoſition of hands upon them, which you tell me there was nothing ſaid, or any words uſed; which if there were not, but only hands impoſed, you muſt give me leave to tell you, that it look'd then but like a dumb ſign, and do not ſee how it could be more operative than if the ſame perſon had ſtroaked a good Boy on the head and ſaid nothing ; but if there were words uſed at the impoſition of hands, then was it not done by impoſition of hands only, as you affirm ; and if words were uſed, as it is not to be doubted, then muſt they certainly be ſuch as be pertinent unto that Ceremony, which muſt expreſs the power thereby given.

Sir, you tell me that I have conquered the Objection, and brought the Controverſie to an end, by granting, *That the offering Sacrifice to God, and celebrating Maſs for the Living and Dead*, was a novel thing, and therefore not eſſential to Orders. But I deny that I ever granted any ſuch thing, although I did that *for the celebrating Maſs for the Living and Dead*, to be within theſe Five Hundred Years expreſſed in the *Roman* Ordinal, but not for *offering Sacrifice unto God*, which I ſaid no ſuch thing, but am aſſured that it was ever in their Ordinal, and alſo their *celebrating Maſs for the Living and Dead* was all along before the practice of that Church ; and therefore the Objection remains ſtill in as much force as ever, and the Controverſie as far diſtant from an end as ever it was before. Might I take leave to add to a Propoſition, and make it run contrary to the true intent and meaning, it were an eaſie matter ſoon to ſalve any Queſtions; but that way would never give the Propoſer any ſatisfaction at all. You alſo tell me, [That whereas I ſay all Prieſtly power is given in the *Roman* Ordinal in the words before, ſpeaking this, *Receive power to offer Sacrifice*, will appear by examining the Ordinal it ſelf to be altogether a miſtake, becauſe if it be good it muſt be in the prayers of the office, or in the imperative words ſpoken by the Biſhop to the Ordained ; in the prayers you will not ſay, for then the prayers of our Ordinal might be allowed to be as valid for this purpoſe, in which the Prieſtly Office is fully expreſſed both by Name and Deſcription, as in theirs.] To which I Anſwer.

That in examining the *Roman* Ordinal, I ſay it will not appear to be a miſtake, which lay on your part to prove that it is in their prayers : This I deny

deny, for I ſay that it is, and that therefore the prayers of our Ordinal muſt be as valid; this alſo I deny, becauſe they do not give ſuch power; and alſo that the Prieſtly Office is as fully expreſſed both in name and deſcription to as good purpoſes as in theirs; for our prayers before doth only give God thanks for calling them to the Office and Miniſtry appointed for the Salvation of Mankind; it doth not actually confer that Authority upon them; and the prayer after is only for a Bleſſing upon the Ordained, which alſo doth neither confer any Authority upon them: But thoſe of the *Roman* doth actually confer all Prieſtly power. And whereas Sir you ſay that the Learnedeſt of the Romaniſts ſay, that the laſt imperative words in their Ordinal, which are ſpoken at the laſt impoſition of hands, (*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*, &c.) are the alone eſſential Form, whereby the Orders of Prieſthood are conferr'd; when I find this can be proved, I may further let you know what I can ſay to it; it may be ſufficient for ſome part of the Prieſthood, but not for all the Offices of it.

To that which you ſay, that the words of our Ordinal giving power to Adminiſter the Sacraments, give power alſo to Conſecrate the Elements. This I denyed, and gave you my Reaſons againſt it before, to which again I refer you. I urged no ſuch thing as you would have me of a general and particular, and therefore your Anſwer to thoſe diſtinctions is beſides the buſineſs. Indeed I Objected, as you ſay, that our Ordinal gave power only to diſpence the Sacraments, and not to Conſecrate; to which you Anſwer, that by the word diſpence, the Church meant the whole that belongs both to the Conſecration and Adminiſtration of them that uſe them: There is no Papiſt, I believe, but will grant that the Church meant and intended it; but the intention of the Church can never veſt any thing with Prieſtly Authority without it be actually and expreſly conferred upon them by Her. For if a Kings intentions be never ſo great to make a Juſtice of Peace, yet he is not thereby at all inveſted with that Authority.

You deny that the Church of *England* thought any part of Prieſthood conferred upon any by vertue of theſe words, [*Do this in remembrance of me*] then I ſay, if no Power or Authority was thereby given by vertue of theſe words, how can She give any by bidding them diſpence the Sacraments for to Conſecrate them? And why then ſo many Arguments uſed about the extenſion and limitation of thoſe words of our Church? And then as I told you before, how ſhall our Church be acquitted from idle Tautologies, which I did not charge Her with, as you were pleaſed to tell me I did, but under ſuch ſuppoſitions and circumſtances which I take that She doth diſown.

You further tell me, that I allow our Form of Epiſcopal Ordination ſufficiently perfect, but you muſt give me leave to tell you that I do not, whereby all your train of conſequences from thence come to nothing: What I ſaid of a Biſhop having no new Character, I ſaid it only in the perſon of

Vaſquez,

Vaſquez, to Anſwer the Objection which you made out of him; for the ſame *Vaſquez* as I told you did ſay, that by the alone words (*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*, &c.) were not ſufficient to make an intire Prieſt, although they were for a Biſhop; from whence I inferred that in *Vaſquez's* judgment a Biſhop received no new Character, but my ſelf was ever of opinion that they did.

As to Biſhop *Ridley*, I am fully ſatisfied that they refuſed to degrade him, as not being made Biſhop by the *Roman* Ordinal; and you may find by the Statutes in the Firſt Year of King *Edward*, that then they took upon them to Adminiſter Sacraments in new ways of their own invention, for which an Act that year was made prohibiting of them, and why might they not alſo as well Conſecrate and Ordain according to their own inventions? But of this I ſhall ſay no more, but refer you to Mr. *Actons* laſt Letter ſent to Mr. *Earbury*, which though I did before, yet never ſee it ſince I received your laſt Paper.

Sir, I ſuppoſe you cannot offer any thing now material unto this point, than already you have, which I believe none could have ſaid more; that if you pleaſe we will ſuperſede this Queſtion, and proceed to another, which is of as great diſatisfaction to me as any, and that is, *Whether any Biſhop or Arch-Biſhop can validly be made ſuch againſt the ſixth Canon of the Councel of* Nice; which ſays, *That no Biſhop ſhall be made without the conſent of his Superiour, or by faculty from him for his Conſecration.*

A. N.

SIR,

YOU muſt pardon me that other buſineſs hath hindered, that I have not been able to look on your Paper till ſeveral days after it came to my hands. And although thereby I ſufficiently perceive you are reſolved againſt receiving any ſatisfaction in the point you applyed to me for it, yet I will endeavour it this one time more, be the effect of it what it will.

And firſt as to your complaint againſt me for not complying with your propoſal, as to Mr. *Acton*; I thought in my laſt I had ſo far convinced you of the abſurdity of it, that I ſhould have heard no more of that. If you would have him Anſwer my Papers, your intimacy with him, of which you ſo often acquaint me, I ſhould think might be ſufficient to engage him to it without that challenge from me, which you are ſo importunate for. I am ſure this gives you a better title to make this propoſal to him, then to require the other ſo abſurd and unreaſonable a thing from me, with whom you never exchanged a word in your life, unleſs by theſe Letters. What I wrote you was for your ſatisfaction, and I told you, if you had any thing further to Object I was ready to hear it, and give you a further Anſwer, and you might take whom you pleaſed into your Conſult as to this matter: But for me to challenge Mr. *Acton* as you propoſed, would be an act of folly, which I deſire to be excuſed from: For that poſſeſſion of right which we

are

are in as to the point controverted between us, doth by no means make it proper for me to take this part upon me. Beſides he is a perſon I never had any thing to do with, or ever received the leaſt provocation from him, and for me in this caſe to challenge him, as you would have me, is in the whole nature of the thing altogether unreaſonable, and in reſpect of that Protection from His Majeſty by which he is here, may be alſo dangerous unto me, and I muſt tell you truly, I durſt not ſo far confide in you as not to miſtruſt there may be a ſnare laid for me hereby.

As to your huff about the Cautions which you tell me I gave you againſt being impoſed on, and the imputation of being ignorant and unwary, which from ſome words in the Paper which you Anſwer, you will needs take home to your ſelf. To the firſt I Anſwer, that ſince you ſeem to acknowledge you do not underſtand Latin, by telling me you are no Schollar nor Linguiſt, and yet quote Fathers, Councils and Schoolmen: I think it poſſible, notwithſtanding your grand conceit of your abilities, to manage Controverſie that you may be very well impoſed on; and therefore that ſuch a caution (if I gave you any) might pertinently enough be recommended unto you: But as I remember I rather ſhowed you where you were moſt groſly impoſed on, in reference to ſome very much miſtaken grounds you went upon, and falſe Quotations which you Objected by way of Anſwer to what I had formerly ſaid, then gave you any advice or caution in this matter. And as to the imputation of being ignorant and unwary, which you will needs take home to your ſelf, if you will do ſo I cannot help that, only I can ſay I never intended it. All that was ſaid was in reference to ſome Arguments the Romaniſts inſiſted on, which I told you were coined for the ignorant and the unwary, and that for other men they had other things to inſiſt upon. For it is the well known artifice of thoſe men to have different ſorts of Arguments for different ſorts of people, which they apply according as they find they will beſt ſute; and this was all I intended to acquaint you with by that expreſſion, and not in the leaſt to reflect on your ſelf. As to your knowledge of the world which you value your ſelf ſo much upon, I verily believe all to be true what you ſay, and that you are altogether as well verſed in it as you would have me to underſtand you are, but I do by no means think that this doth any way the better capacitate you for the judging of matters in Religion, but quite the contrary: For the things of this World, and the things of God are uſually put in that oppoſition to each other in Scripture, and are in their nature ſo contrary the one to the other, that they never will ſubſiſt together, but where there is a mind addicted to the former, it always is a great obſtruction to the later, and uſually puts ſuch a biaſs upon the judgments of men in all their inquiries concerning Religion, as makes them ever run that way where their intereſt moſt inclines them, and I ſhould be glad to be aſſured this is not your caſe, I having been ſo often told that it is ſo.

As

As to thoſe modeſt, fair, candid and learned Gentlemen whom you ſo much magnifie, and with whom of late you have got ſo great an intimacy, I am not ſo much acquainted with any of them as to enter in any diſpute with you about the Character you give them, and am ſo far from detracting from it, or being in the leaſt diſturbed by any thing you tell me of this nature, that nothing is more acceptable unto me, then to hear of men endowed with thoſe worthy qualifications, and none ſhall be more ready than my ſelf to reverence them, wherever they are found, although in an Adverſary. What paſſage it is in Dr. *Brevints* Witch of *Endor* you reflect on, for telling you the contrary of thoſe men I know not, (it being a Book I have not this long time ſeen) only this I know, that he is too worthy a perſon to impoſe a lye upon the World, eſpecially in ſo unjuſtifiable a matter, as that of raiſing a falſe accuſation againſt any one, and too well acquainted with that ſort of men by his long converſe among them in the Court of *France*, (where he attended many years as Chaplain to the Princeſs of *Turenne*, and had all the opportunities imaginable of informing himſelf concerning them) as to be in any likelyhood of being deceived in any thing that he may relate in reference to them. And it is by no means an argument of his dealing falſly in this matter, that you find two or three in this place, that to your obſervation may ſeem to be otherwiſe then he relates: For what is ſaid by him I ſuppoſe was never intended to belong to all, there being no Proteſtant which will not freely acknowledge that there are ſeveral men in the Church of *Rome* of great Eminency both for Learning and Goodneſs, notwithſtanding the Errors they are under as to matters of Religion, and we are ſo far from repining at it that we all heartily wiſh there were more ſuch among them, they being the only men from whom we may hope for an happy iſſue to the Controverſie between us, by bringing all thoſe corruptions (which they well know) to the ſame Reformation. But however in this place, where you now converſe with them, I think you may very well be deceived in taking all for Gold that gliſters. You are to conſider what is the deſign which brings thoſe men among us, it is to make Proſelites to their Church, and draw men over to their Religion, and you cannot but apprehend that it chiefly behoves them that come on ſuch an errand to put their beſt ſide outward, and recommend themſelves to the good opinion of thoſe they would ſeduce by all the appearances of Vertue, Goodneſs and Piety, that they can put on, which is an artifice too well known to be the conſtant practice of thoſe that would deceive the people. And therefore notwithſtanding their Sheeps Cloathing, they may be ſtill for any thing you know inwardly ravening Wolves. For here they appear not as they are, but only according to the part which they are to act among us; if you will truly know them thoſe places are propereſt for this where they appear in their own colours, at their own homes in Roman Catholick Countries, where they have no ſuch deſigns to carry on as with

with us, which require the mask and the diſguiſe, and if you will not go ſo far your ſelf to be informed concerning them by your own view, you muſt be content only to know them by ſuch Pictures as others have drawn of them, who have there ſeen them at the life. And if you will not rely upon the fidelity of Dr *Brevint* for this, I will refer you to one of their own Communion, the Author of the *Sure and honeſt means for the Converſion of Hereticks*, a Book firſt wrote in *French*, and now lately publiſhed in our Language, in which I ſuppoſe you may have it at any Bookſellers ſhop in this Town: But I would not have you to underſtand me to ſay any thing of this by way of reflection on the Gentlemen you mention, for they are totally unknown to me, and therefore I can ſay nothing of them as to their particular perſons, either good or evil; all that I intend hereby is to vindicate Dr. *Brevint*, and to let you know that notwithſtanding any thing you may have obſerved concerning this ſort of men, all that hath been ſaid by that worthy perſon concerning them may be ſtill true.

In your next Paragraph you tell me, I plainly ſay, what is plainly moſt falſe, and do from he beginning to the end of it ſo groſly prevaricate, by miſreciting what I ſaid of the Presbyterians giving the occaſion for the alteration of the Ordinal in 62, and by diſtorting and wreſting it to ſuch meaning for your purpoſe, as the words can never bear, that it ſufficiently appears you are more zealouſly concerned that the Calumnies of our Adverſaries in this particular might ſtick upon us, then to receive that ſatisfaction herein which you pretend to deſire. Now for the more evidencing of this matter I ſhall lay down my words, and your Quotation of them together, that ſo by comparing of them it may appear how unfaithfully you have dealt with me herein.

My words in my firſt Paper.

"The alterations, or rather explanatory additions made in our Ordinal in the year 1662, were not inſerted out of any reſpect to the Controverſie we have with the Church of *Rome*, but only to ſilence a cavil of the *Preſbyterians*, who from the Old Ordinal drew an Argument to prove that there was no difference between a Biſhop and a Prieſt, becauſe (as they ſay) their offices were not diſtinguiſhed in the words whereby they were conferred on them when Ordained, or any power given a Biſhop which he had not afore as a Prieſt.

Your Quotation of them.

"That the *Preſbyterians* objected that in the Ordinal there was no difference between a Biſhop and a Prieſt, becauſe their offices were not at all diſtinguiſhed in the words by which they were conferred on them when Ordained, and that to obviate the above mentioned cavil of the *Preſbyterians*, the explanatory words were inſerted.

Now Sir be you your own Judge whether you have fairly recited what I have ſaid, or whether my words can at all bear that meaning which you will needs put upon them: Do I mention any thing of the *Presbyterians* objecting againſt the ſufficiency of the Ordinal, or urging this reaſon for it, that the offices of Prieſt and Biſhop were not ſufficiently diſtinguiſhed in the words by which they were conferred, or that the explanatory words were inſerted to give them ſatisfaction herein, as you would have me ſay? Or can any man that is not groſly deficient either in his underſtanding or his integrity put this ſenſe upon my words? Do you think I am ignorant that it is the Fundamental Doctrine of the *Presbyterian* Sect, that there is no difference at all between a Biſhop, and a Presbyter or Prieſt? Or that I could poſſibly ſay that they ſhould urge it for a defect in our Ordinal, that thoſe offices are not ſufficiently diſtinguiſhed therein, when it is their main principle that there is no diſtinction at all between them, but that they are only two names ſignifying the ſame Function? Or can any thing which I ſaid have any other reference, but to an Argument which I told you they drew from our Ordinal to prove this againſt us. That the Presbyterians hated the name of Prieſt, I freely grant, and ſo do we too as it means a Sacrificing Prieſt, in the ſenſe of the Romaniſts: But that the name of Biſhop was ſo odious to them I deny. For it is found in Scripture, it is found in all the Antient Writers of the Church, and therefore they could not be ſo impious as to hate a name which had the ſtamp of ſuch Authority upon it. All the Controverſie was about the ſignification of this name, whether it did import an Order diſtinct from the Order of Prieſthood, and this they denyed; and in their diſputes againſt us in the late times concerning it, made uſe of an Argument againſt us, (as I told you) which was drawn from our own Ordinal, and from the Form of Conſecrating a Biſhop urged, that according to the Doctrine of our own Church, the Office of a Biſhop could not be diſtinct from the Office of a Presbyter or Prieſt, becauſe no new Authority was given him in that Form (as they would have it) which he had not afore as a Presbyter or Prieſt; and therefore to make a more clear diſtinction between the two Functions, and take away all occaſions for their urging of this againſt us for the future in the defence of that Error, the explanatory words were inſerted, and on no other account. When I wrote you my former Paper I confeſs I quoted no other Authority for this but that I had been told ſo. But ſince looking into Dr. *Burnets* Hiſtory of the Reformation, I there find him ſaying the ſame thing in theſe words: *So they agreed on a Form of Ordaining Deacons, Prieſts and Biſhops, which is the ſame we yet uſe, except in ſome few words that have been added ſince in the Ordination of a Prieſt or Biſhop, for there was then no expreſs mention made in the words of Ordaining them, that it was for the one or the other Office, in both it was ſaid,* Receive thou the Holy Ghoſt in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy

Hiſtory of the Reformation, *Part* 2. *p.*144.

Holy Ghoſt: *But that having been ſince made uſe of to prove both Functions the ſame, it was of late years altered as it is now. Nor were theſe words, being the ſame in giving both Orders, any ground to infer that the Church eſteemed them one Order, the reſt of the office ſhewing the contrary very plainly.* Thus far Dr. *Burnet*; and he having publiſhed it within twenty years after the thing was done, when ſo many were alive that were Members of Convocation when the alteration was made, and eſpecially Dr. *Gunning* and Dr. *Peirſon*, who I underſtand were the prime adviſers of it, it is impoſſible he could want true information in this particular, or be ſo impudent as to impoſe it on the World, if otherwiſe then he relates, when there were ſo many in being, who from their own knowledge could convince him of falſity herein. And therefore the thing being ſo plain, I hope you will reſt ſatisfied in this particular. But I muſt not let you go yet, for you are not only contented to wreſt and miſrecite what I have wrote you for your ſatisfaction, but alſo charge me with whole ſentences of which I never ſaid one word, or any thing like it: For in which of my Papers, I beſeech you, do I ever ſay that the Presbyterians vindicated their Form to be as good as ours, or what the leaſt Foundation is there given you in any of them to forge my name to ſuch a ſaying. I very well know thoſe men were againſt all Forms as well as you, and therefore need not your information in this particular: But it ſeems by your ſo great intimacy with our Adverſaries, (which you ſo often tell me of) you have learnt their tricks, to wreſt, falſifie and miſrecite; the only methods they have to ſupport ſo bad a cauſe. But that there may in this matter be no more room for this, I ſhall diſtinctly lay down what I hope may obviate all further cavils concerning it, in theſe following particulars.

Firſt, That the Objection of the Presbyterians was not againſt the Ordinal but againſt Epiſcopacy.

Secondly, That it being the Doctrine of the Presbyterians that the Office of a Biſhop and a Presbyter, or Prieſt, is one and the ſame, and not at all diſtinct, but that both names equally belong to every Presbyter; to prove this they made uſe of an Argument againſt us from our Ordinal, urging that the Form of Epiſcopal Ordination therein ſuperadded no new Authority to that which was afore given him by the Prieſtly, and therefore that both Offices were the ſame according to our own Ordinal.

Thirdly, That if this Argument implies any defect in our Old Ordinal, it placeth it only in the Form of Epiſcopal Ordination, and not in the Prieſtly, and concerning this only you have ſeveral times told me your whole doubt is.

Fourthly, The Presbyterians urging this is by no means an Argument that there is any ſuch defect in the Form of Epiſcopal Ordination in our Old Ordinal, for God forbid all ſhould be true which Adverſaries uſe to urge againſt each other in their diſputes about Religion.

Fifthly, That if this be a defect in our Old Ordinal the Papiſts have no reaſon to urge it, theirs being much more defective, as I have already told you; for in the Conſecration of a Biſhop at the impoſition of hands they uſe no other Form then theſe words only, [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt.*]

As to what you tell me that the Papiſts are more formidable to the Church of *England* then all the Sects together, in point of weight; if you ſpeak this in reference to their Doctrines, or any thing that they can ſay to defend them, I am ſo far from being of your opinion that of all the Sects that have infeſted the Church of Chriſt, which have been able to make any plauſible ſhow of Argument for themſelves, I think theirs, bating the Patronage of Princes, (to which it chiefly owes its ſupport) to be the moſt defenceleſs, which may ſufficiently appear by the preſent management of the Controverſie between us, in which their cauſe hath been ſo miſerably baffled that they are in a manner plainly put to ſilence. Few now of thoſe many Tracts which are written againſt them, being at all Anſwered by them. And when ſometimes with a great deal of noiſe they ſend forth a Pamphlet againſt us, their performance is always ſo lame, and what they have to ſay for themſelves ſo far ſhort of giving any ſatisfaction in the Points controverted between us, that it is ſufficiently evidenced hereby that their cauſe is ſuch as will not bear a defence.

The next thing you tell me is, that you have received your *Eraſtus* Senior and your *Eraſtus* Junior, and can find no mention made in any part of them of the alteration of our Ordinal; it ſeems then you have them both to ſerve the cauſe you would maintain, although you denyed you had either, when I would have borrowed one of them of you, in order to the better giving you the ſatisfaction which you deſired. But becauſe you ſay you cannot find the paſſage I refer to, I will give you the words as I find them in the laſt page of the *Eraſtus* Senior, which I have; they are as followeth; *Since the Printing of this they have acknowledged the juſtneſs of our exception to their Forms, by amending them in their new Book, Authorized by the late Act for Uniformity*, &c. which words being put after the concluſion of the Book, do ſufficiently enough themſelves expreſs that they were put there between the time of finiſhing and publiſhing of it; that it was after the finiſhing of it is ſaid in them, and that it was before the publiſhing of it is demonſtrable from their being there, and conſequently the publication of this Book muſt be after the publication of the Liturgy. Now the Liturgy not being publiſhed after its review and amendment till the latter end of *Auguſt*, 1662. its evident from thence that it muſt be after that time that this *Eraſtus* Senior firſt came forth, and therefore it could not any way influence the alteration made in our Ordinal, publiſhed with that Liturgy, as you would have it; the whole being perfected the *January* before; for the Parliament began to ſit *January* the 7th. and the third Act which was paſſed we find to be the

Act

Act of Uniformity, wherein this Liturgy with the Ordinal were confirmed, and conſequently it muſt in the very beginning of the Seſſions have been made ready by the Convocation for them.

And whereas you require of me to tell you who thoſe ſober Papiſts were that exploded thoſe Books at their coming out, I name unto you Father *Peter Walſh* for one, who was the perſon I mentioned to have wrote a Book againſt them which he preſented to the late Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, and is now in ſeveral hands in Manuſcript, and Dr. *Burnet* tells you he had the peruſal of it. But you demand of me to let you ſee this in Print, and then you ſay you may be of my mind; to which I Anſwer, that I gladly accept of the condition, and if you will perform your promiſe hereon we ſhall have no occaſion to diſpute any further about this matter. For although Father *Walſh* hath not yet Printed the Book I mention, yet he hath the ſubſtance of it in the Preface to his Hiſtory of the *Iriſh* Remonſtrance, where you may find it; but becauſe perchance this Book is not to be had in this place, I will refer you to another of his, where you will find him ſaying the ſame thing, that is in his Preface to his four Letters lately publiſhed, and common enough to be had in every Bookſellers ſhop. For there making an Apology to thoſe of his Religion, for calling the Biſhop of *Lincoln* moſt Illuſtrious and moſt Reverend, in the Letter to him which he wrote in defence of the Church of *Rome*, as to the depoſing Doctrine, againſt a Book which his Lordſhip had publiſhed on that Argument; he gives his Reaſons for it in theſe following words; *I had about twelve years ſince in the Preface to my Hiſtory of the* Iriſh *Remonſtrance, publickly in Print, acknowledged my opinion to be, that the Ordination of the Proteſtant Church of* England *is valid, meaning it undoubtedly to be ſo, according both to the publick Doctrine of the Roman Catholick Schools themſelves, and the ancient Rituals of all Catholick Churches,* Latin *and* Greek, *nay, and to thoſe Rituals of all the Oriental Heterodox Churches too, as* Morinus *a Learned Oratorian hath recorded them.* Thus far Father *Walſh*, and what can be a more expreſs acknowledgment in a Papiſt of the thing which you require; and this being in Print, and to be ſeen by you when you pleaſe to conſult the Book to which I direct you; I hope you will remember your promiſe of being of my mind hereon, and acquieſce in this Authority. But he is not the only man of that Religion that allows our Orders to be good and valid, abundance more are of his mind herein, and ſeveral have taken the ſame freedom of expreſſing it, although to the diſadvantage of their own cauſe. Father *Davenport*, alias *Sancta Clara*, another Prieſt of the Romiſh Church, is altogether as expreſs in this matter as Father *Walſh*; for in his Expoſition on the 36th Article of our Church, he proves from *Vaſquez*, *Conink*, *Arcudius*, and *Innocent* the 4th. that our Church hath all the eſſentials of Ordination required in Scripture; and as to our Form of Ordination, he plainly ſays, that if the difference of the words herein from their Form

do

do annul our Ordinations, it muſt annul thoſe of the *Greek* Church too; for the Form of the *Greek* Church altogether differs as much from the Form of the *Roman*, as doth that of the *Engliſh*. And *Cudſemius*, one that writes violently enough againſt us, ſpeaks alſo to the ſame purpoſe, which he would never have done but that the manifeſt certainty of the thing extorted this conceſſion from him. For he coming into *England* in the year 1608. to obſerve the ſtate of our Church, and the Order of our Univerſities, was ſo far convinced of the validity of our Orders by his inquiry into this particular, that in a Book Printed two years after, on his return home, he hath theſe words; *Concerning the ſtate of the* Calvinian *Sect in* England, *it ſo ſtandeth, that either it may endure long, or be changed ſuddenly, or in a trice, in regard of the Catholick Order there in a perpetual Line of their Biſhops, and the Lawful Succeſſion of Paſtors received from the Church, for the honour whereof we uſe to call the Engliſh* Calviniſts *by a milder term, not Hereticks, but Schiſmaticks.* And in the late times, when one *Goffe* went over unto the Church of *Rome*, a Queſtion ariſing about the validity of our Orders, on his taking upon him at *Paris* to ſay Maſs by vertue of his Orders received in our Church; it was referred to the *Sorbon* to examine the matter, where it being fully diſcuſſed, they gave in their opinion that our Orders were good; and this I have by the Teſtimony of one now an eminent Papiſt, who ſome years ſince told me the whole Story from his own knowledge, he being then in *Paris*, when the whole matter was there tranſacted; and although afterwards, as he told me, the Pope determined otherwiſe of this matter, and ordered the Arch-Biſhop of *Paris* to reordain him, yet the *Sorboniſts* ſtill ſtuck to their opinion that he was a good Prieſt by his firſt Ordination. And if you will know whence this difference in the determination aroſe, it was that the one proceeded according to the merits of the cauſe, and the other as would beſt ſute with his own intereſt, and the intereſt of the party he was to ſupport.

De Deprat Calvini cauſa, cap. 11. pag. 108.

The next thing which you require of me is to give you proof that it is now the received Doctrine of the Romaniſts, that the eſſential Form of Ordination is in the power of the Church to alter. To which I Anſwer, That by the eſſential Form (for the word eſſential is of your own interpoſing) I ſuppoſe you mean that Form of words in the Roman Ordinal, which joyned with the matter (according to them) imprints the Character, and makes up the whole eſſence of Orders; and underſtanding you thus, I freely grant that the whole cry of the Romiſh Schools, runs againſt this aſſertion, their Doctrine being, that both the Matter and Form of Orders as well as of their other Sacraments, were inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf, and that neither of them are in the power of any to alter, but that they have been the ſame from the beginning, as we now find them in their Ordinal; and therefore cannot admit of any variation without annulling the whole Sacrament (as they call it)

it.) And that they have been thus preſerved down unto us by conſtant Tradition from our Saviours time: For they freely grant that they have no proof for them that they were thus inſtituted by Chriſt, either from Scripture, or from any of the Writings of the Antients. And to this purpoſe the words of *Eſtius* [illegible], are as followeth. (*a*) *And here you muſt know that we have the matter and form of every Sacrament, not as much from Scripture as by a continued Tradition received down from the Apoſtles: For the Scripture expreſly delivers to us only the matter and form of Baptiſm and the Euchariſt, and of extream Unction the matter only: The others are left us only by unwritten Tradition, thereby as from hand to hand to be received down unto us.* And in another place particularly as to the Matter and Form of Orders he tells us; (*b*) *That the Antient Fathers of the Church ſpoke ſparingly of them in their Writings*: And ſo others of them to the ſame purpoſe. (*c*) And for this they gave a Reaſon forſooth, leaſt thoſe things being conſigned to Writing might come to be known to unbelievers, and ſo expoſed to be ſcoffed at, and ridicul'd by them; for it ſeems they cannot but acknowledge that many of thoſe Rites which they make uſe of, as well in Ordination as in their other Sacraments of their own making, are indeed ridiculous. But here I muſt tell you that this is only the Doctrine of the Schoolmen, and thoſe which wrote after them: But *Morinus* the Learned Oratorian, I have often mentioned unto you, taxeth them of great ignorance herein, in that being totally unacquainted with the Antient Rituals, and the practice of other Churches, framed all their Doctrines according to the preſent Ordinal of their Church. But ſince that Learned perſon hath Publiſhed ſo large a Collection of Antient Ordinals, many of which have none at all of thoſe Forms now in the Roman Ordinal, and the practice alſo of the *Greek* Church which uſeth none of them is become better known; this Doctrine of the Divine Inſtitution of thoſe Forms, and that they cannot be altered or varied from, becomes generally exploded; and concerning this, becauſe you deſire me to prove it unto you, I will firſt give you the words of *Habertus* in his Obſervations on the *Greek* Pontifical, in whom you have alſo the ſence of the whole *Sorbon*, who Licenſed and Authorized his Book. For he raiſing an Objection how it could be poſſible that the Orders conferred by the *Greek* Church as well as the *Latin* could be both right, ſince Adminiſtred by different Forms, gives this Anſwer thereto: *In the Sacraments, of whoſe matter and form there is no expreſs mention in Scripture, it is to be ſuppoſed that Chriſt inſtituted both only in general to His Apoſtles, leaving to the Church a power to deſign, conſtitute and determine them ſeveral ways, as it ſhall ſeem beſt unto them; ſo that the chief ſubſtance, intention and ſcope of the inſtitution were ſtill retained, with ſome general fitneſs and*

(a) *Lib.* 4. *Diſtinct.* 1. Sect. 18.

(b) *Lib.* 4. *Diſtinct.* 24. Sect. 2.

(c) *Eſtius*, ibid.

Page 125.

and analogy, for ſignifying the effect, grace and character of the Sacrament, which analogy is alike and intire in both Rites, as well the Greek *as the* Roman.

Page 485. And the words of *Hallier*, another *Sorboniſt*, and whoſe Book is in the ſame manner Licenſed by that Learned Society of Divines; ſpeak the ſame thing; for he laying down this as an evident concluſion from what he had afore ſaid, that many things had been added and changed about the Matter and Form of Orders; and that through the whole Church, as it is diffuſed over the whole World, the ſame Rite of Ordination, and the ſame Matter, and the ſame Form is not uſed; that the *Eaſtern* Churches perform Ordinations by one Rite, and the *Weſtern* by another, without diſallowing the Orders of each other; he ſolves the matter by telling us that Chriſt inſtituted only in general, that there ſhould be Matter and Form in Ordination, but left it to the Church to determine the particular; that is, what particular Matter, and what particular Form ſhould be made uſe of in this Adminiſtration. And *Morinus* alſo ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe; for in his third Book *de Ordinationibus*, *Exercit.* 7. *cap.* 6. *n.* 2. he ſaith, *That Chriſt determined no particular Matter and Form in Orders*, and in another place, *cap.* 3. *n.* 6. he tells us, *That it ſtrikes him with aſtoniſhment that there ſhould be ſuch an alteration both as to Matter and Form in that Sacrament*; as by examining the Antient Liturgies he finds there hath been. And Cardinal *Lugo's* words are altogether as expreſs in this matter, who in his Book *de Sacramentis*, *Diſput.* 2. *Sect.* 3. plainly ſaith, *That Chriſt left the Church at Liberty, both as to the Matter and Form of Orders.* And ſo alſo ſaith *Arcudius* a Learned *Greek*, that was deſigned to have been a Cardinal, in his Book *de Sacramentis*, *lib.* 6. *cap.* 4. where he lays it down as that which the moſt Learned hold, *That the Sacrament of Orders* (as he calls it) *is ſo inſtituted by Chriſt, that the Ordaining of Miniſters ſhould be performed by ſome words and external ſigns, by which the Miniſtry to which they were Ordained might be ſufficiently ſignified; but that any particular external ſigns ſhould be made uſe of rather than others, was totally left by him to the arbitriment of the Church.* And he quotes for proof hereof the third Chapter of the 23th Seſſion of the Council of *Trent*, where it is ſaid only, *That Ordination is to be performed with words and external ſigns*, without aſſigning what words or what ſigns theſe ought to be, from whence he infers *they may be any.* And to the ſame purpoſe alſo ſpeaks *Tapperus* of the Forms of the Sacraments in general, and of the Sacrament of Orders in particular; whom *Vaſquez* as to both thoſe takes great pains to confute. And there is another of the ſame opinion, whoſe Authority muſt be certainly infallible with thoſe of that Communion, that is Pope *Innocent* the 4th. who ſaith, *It is found to be a Rite uſed by the Apoſtles, that they laid hands on perſons to be Ordained, and poured out prayers over them, but we find not any other obſerved by them, from whence*

De Sacramentis non iterandis cap. Preſbyt.

whence we believe, that unleſs there had been Forms afterwards invented, it would have been ſufficient for the Ordainer to have ſaid, be thou a Prieſt, or any other words of the ſame importance, but in after times the Church Ordained thoſe Forms which are now obſerved. And Father *Davenport*, alias *Sancta Clara*, hath thoſe words : * *Many Doctors do not without probability think that Chriſt appointed neither the Matter nor Form of Orders, but left both to be aſſigned by the Church.* And thus far having produced the authorities and proofs which you required, I hope I have given you ſatisfaction herein, and that the opinion of the Schoolmen in aſſerting that the eſſential Form of Orders (as you call it) is immutable, and not in the power of any Church to alter, is altogether wrong. And that it is ſo, thoſe that aſſert the Doctrine which I have laid down in oppoſition to them, have this unanſwerable Argument for it, that thoſe very eſſential Forms (as they call them) of Prieſtly Ordination, which they would have to be inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf, and always from the beginning to have continued in the Church immutably the ſame, are both of ſo late date, that the one of them was never uſed till within theſe four hundred years, and the other not till within theſe ſeven hundred years at the fartheſt, as by comparing the Antient Ordinals of the Romiſh Church doth manifeſtly appear.

* *Expoſit. Paraphraſt. in Artic. 36. Eccleſiæ Ang.* pag. 325.

In the next place you tell me, that although *Morinus* ſhould have obſerved that for a thouſand years the imperative Form [*be thou a Prieſt*] was not uſed in the Roman Ordinals, yet he doth not ſay they did not expreſly give all Prieſtly power in other words, or by equivalency, by giving full power to perform all the Offices of it, which you deny our Old Ordinal did. To this I Anſwer, That I know of no Ordinal that ever had this Form in it, [*be thou a Prieſt*] or of any that was ever Ordained by it to the Prieſtly Office, neither do I refer you to *Morinus* for any thing concerning it. In your Papers I obſerved you were much ſtumbled at the additional alterations we made in the Forms of our Ordinations, as if theſe additions being in an eſſential part (as you ſuppoſe) muſt neceſſarily infer an eſſential defect to have been in our Ordinals before, and conſequently make null and void all the Orders of our Church, conferred by them ; or if otherwiſe, that we could not juſtifie the alterations we have made. To alter the introductory and concomitant prayers you ſeem willing to allow us a power, but not to make any change in ſo eſſential a part as the Form it ſelf, and challenge me to ſhow you when ever the Church of *Rome* did ſo. In Anſwer whereto I told you, that thoſe Forms which you think ſo eſſential to Orders are ſo far from being ſo, that the Church of *Rome* it ſelf, for near a thouſand years after Chriſt, never uſed any ſuch Forms at all, that is, any imperative words at all, denoting the conferring of the Office by the perſon Ordaining, but the whole Rite was performed by prayer and impoſition of hands only, without any

imperative words at all ſpoken to the perſon Ordained, denoting his taking Authority to execute either the whole, or any part of the Office conferred on him; and for the making out of this I referred you to *Morinus* his *Collection of Antient Ordinals*, wherein he having publiſhed ſixteen of the moſt antient Rituals of Prieſtly Ordination of the *Latin* Church that could be found; in the ten firſt of them no ſuch Form doth at all appear to be uſed, but in all of them the whole Rite of Ordination is performed by impoſition of hands and prayer only; and the eleventh Ordinal in his Collection, compoſed as he judgeth in the tenth Century, is the firſt that uſed this Form; [*Receive thou power to offer Sacrifice unto God, and to celebrate Maſs both for the Living and the Dead,*] and the other, [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins thou doſt forgive they are forgiven unto them, and whoſe ſins thou doſt retain they are retained*] is not found till in the laſt of them, compoſed about four hundred years ſince. And this I think to be a plain demonſtration of the novel introduction of thoſe Forms into the Roman Ordinals. And that they were totally unknown to the Antients I endeavoured further to make appear unto you, by ſhowing you, that in none of their Writings there is any mention made of them, no not in thoſe places where they profeſſedly treat of Orders, and all the Rites belonging thereto, as in the Canons of the Council of *Carthage*, which preſcribes the whole manner of Ordination, and in the Book of Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy aſcribed to *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, which is alſo very particular in deſcribing all the Rites belonging thereto; and in neither of theſe is the leaſt mention made of any ſuch imperative Forms, or any thing like thereto; and I added alſo thoſe places of Scripture which give us an account of the Ordination of the ſeven Deacons, and of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, to be the Apoſtles of the *Gentiles*, in which there is nothing from whence we can infer the uſe of any ſuch imperative Forms, but that prayers and impoſition of hands was all that was then done in thoſe Ordinations. And from all this I did (I think with ſufficient reaſon) infer that thoſe Forms in which the Church of *Rome* placeth the eſſence of their Orders, are ſo far from being thus eſſential to them, that for many Ages they never uſed any ſuch at all in any of their Ordinations: And I might alſo, for the inferring of the ſame Concluſion, have made uſe of many other ſuch like Authorities, as of the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions publiſhed under the name of St. *Clement* Biſhop of *Rome*, * which makes mention of the Biſhops laying on his hands on the Presbyter, to be Ordaining and ſaying a prayer over him, but nothing of any imperative Form, bidding him to take Authority to do either the whole or any part of his Office then conferred on him. And the Authority of † St. *Hierom*, a Cardinal of the Church of *Rome*, is moſt expreſs in this matter, that the whole Rite of Ordination was compleated, *impoſitione manus & imprecatione vocis*,

* *Lib.* 8. *c.* 24.

† *Lib.* 16. *in Eſaiam.*

vocis, i. e. *by the impoſition of the hand, the prayer of the voice.* But you except againſt all thoſe Arguments, and deny them to be concluſive, becauſe there being in none of thoſe Authorities I have mentioned, any words excluding the uſe of thoſe Forms, the not mentioning of them in the places I have quoted you think is by no means an Argument that there were none ſuch, and you tell me, that ſhould any Learned Papiſt have offered you ſuch an Argument as this, you ſhould conclude then that he went about to impoſe upon you. And yet Sir I can tell you of ſeveral Learned Papiſts which uſe theſe very ſame Arguments to prove the ſame thing; *Habertus* doth it as to one of them, and makes uſe not only of ſome of thoſe Authorities I have mentioned, but alſo of ſeveral others, as of St. *Gregory*, *Iſodore* and *Amalarius*, as may be ſeen page the 124th of his Obſervations on the *Greek* Pontifical. And *Morinus* doth it as to all of them, and ſo doth Pope *Innocent* the 4th. in the words I have afore cited out of him; for in them he tells you that it is found to be a Rite uſed by the Apoſtles, to lay hands on the perſons to be Ordained, and pray over them, but that he finds not any other Rite obſerved by them, and from hence concludes that the Forms now uſed in the Church of *Rome* were invented afterwards. And I could name ſeveral others that argue in this very thing after the ſame manner; but inſtead of enlarging any further upon that head, I will take leave to ſhow you how much you are miſtaken in thinking this no good way of arguing from the very nature of the thing it ſelf. For the thing which I take to prove is, that thoſe Forms now uſed in the Church of *Rome* are not Antient, and the only way I have to prove this, is to ſearch Antiquity for it, and if I can find no footſteps in any Antient Ritual of any ſuch Forms uſed in Ordination, or any mention made of them in thoſe Antient Writers of the Church, which treat of Ordination, all that underſtand affairs of this nature muſt allow it a good Argument, to conclude from hence, that they were not at all antiently in uſe, and in things of this nature there is no other way of Arguing, and it is that which all Learned Men, that write of Church Antiquities, and the uſages of the Antients, conſtantly uſe, and ten thouſand inſtances may be given hereof; for to deny thoſe Authorities, which I have inſiſted on, to be good againſt the antient uſe of thoſe Forms, becauſe there are no words in them expreſly excluding them, is that which, when you conſider again, you muſt acknowledge to be a very unreaſonable thing; for how can you expect that the negation of the uſe of a thing ſhould be expreſſed in any Writer before the thing it ſelf was ever invented, or came in practice. Thoſe imperative Forms now in uſe in the Church of *Rome* were not then as much as thought of; and how then could the Writers of thoſe paſſages I have quoted, expreſs any thing either negatively or affirmatively concerning them: And that which you require to make the Argument ſtrong on my ſide, would really make it conclude the contrary way; for whereas thoſe

paſſages have only a ſilence as to thoſe Forms, ſhould they have alſo words denying the uſe of them, they would rather prove the Antiquity of their uſe, then make againſt it; becauſe the mention of them in any manner whatever would neceſſarily prove them to have been in uſe before mentioned, otherwiſe how could any mention be made of them at all. But ſince in all the Writing of the Antients, they are never as much as once mentioned, no not in thoſe places where they, treating of Orders, and the manner of Ordination, could not poſſibly paſs them over in ſilence were there any ſuch things then in uſe; nor any of the antient Rituals of Ordination for near a thouſand years having the leaſt footſteps of them, nor the *Greek* Church having any thing like them, it is as ſtrong an Argument as poſſibly the nature of the thing can bear, that antiently there were no ſuch things at all as thoſe Forms, which the Church of *Rome* will now have to be the grand eſſentials of all their Ordinations; and there is no rational man but muſt be convinced hereby: For were they antiently known, and looked on as things ſo eſſential to Ordination, as the Church of *Rome* would have, it is utterly impoſſible there could be ſuch a total ſilence of them for ſo many Ages after Chriſt, as I have mentioned in all that have wrote of this matter.

As to my not giving you the very words of the Council of *Carthage*, and of the Book of *Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy*, which I quoted, I am not to be blamed in this matter, becauſe thoſe paſſages which I referred to taking up ſeveral Pages, would be too long to tranſcribe; eſpecially I being then involv'd in other buſineſs, which would not allow me time for ſo tedious and needleſs a task: If you doubted of my fidelity, as to the quoting of thoſe paſſages, you might have been pleaſed to call at my Study, and the Books ſhould there have been laid before you. Your Paper cites the words of the third Canon of the Council of *Carthage*, but all the four firſt Canons belong to this matter, for in them, that Council preſcribing the manner of Ordaining Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, makes mention only of impoſition of hands, with the Bleſſing given by the Ordainer, but nothing at all of any of thoſe imperative Forms in which the Church of *Rome* now a days placeth the eſſence of Orders. And as to the words of the Book of the *Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy*, aſcribed to *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite*, I find none ſuch in that Author as are contained in your Paper, and therefore I ſuppoſe you tranſcribed them not from the Book it ſelf, but only wrote after ſome perſon that had given you the ſumme of them; and if I miſtake not, you have made uſe of Dr. *Burnet* in this particular, for the paſſage which I refer to in *Dionyſius* contains ſeveral pages in *Folio*; for he having firſt deſcribed the manner of Ordaining Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons, afterwards goeth over every ſingle Rite in a very particular and exact manner; and according to his way of Writing finds a Myſtery in every one of them; but amongſt all thoſe particulars which he ſo exactly recites, there is none of the leaſt mention

tion made of any imperative Forms ſpoken at the impoſition of hands, or at the performance of any other Rite belonging to that matter; and this ſilence of them, where there is ſo particular a mention of every thing elſe, is an undeniable preſumption that there was then no ſuch thing in uſe.

But to all that I have ſaid in denying the antient uſe of thoſe Forms, you have this Anſwer, that it ſeems irrational that there ſhould be no words ſpoken by the Biſhop at the laying on of his hand upon the Ordained, and that at this rate the laying on of hands would ſeem only a dumb and inſignificant ſign, and would in your opinion be nothing at all operative to the conferring of the Office on the perſon Ordained: To which I reply.

Firſt, That how inſignificant ſoever you may eſteem the outward Ceremony, without thoſe words which you call the eſſential Form in the Conſecration of a Chriſtian Prieſt, yet if you pleaſe to read the 8th Chapter of *Leviticus*, you will there find that *Aaron* and his Sons were Conſecrated to the *Levitical* Prieſthood by the outward Ceremony only, without as much as any one word ſpoken by *Moſes* the Conſecrator, ſignifying the Holy Office to which they were ſet apart. And * *Maimonides* the moſt Authentick Writer among the Rabbies, gives us an account, that in after times the Conſecration of the High Prieſt among the *Jews* was performed only by the Anointing with the Holy Oyl, and Veſting with the High Prieſts Veſtments, and after the deſtruction of the firſt Temple in which the Holy Oyl was loſt, by Veſting him only. For outward ſigns can by general inſtitution be made as expreſſive of any thing of this nature, as a form of words; for words are only ſounds, appointed by the common conſent of thoſe that uſe them to be the ſigns of things, and when outward actions are appointed to ſignifie the ſame things they are altogether as expreſſive; and the King of *France*, by delivering the Sword to the Conſtable, and a Staff to a Marſhal of *France*, doth as effectually create thoſe Officers by that outward Ceremony only, as if he had done it by a Form of words, the moſt expreſſive of the Authority and Power given that could be deviſed, becauſe the Laws of the Kingdom, and the long received Cuſtoms of it have made theſe Ceremonies alone the well known manner of Conſtituting thoſe Officers: And had the Laws of the Chriſtian Church, or the long received uſages of it, made any outward Ceremony whatever, in like manner, the well known Rite of Ordaining a Prieſt, it would be altogether as valid for this purpoſe without any Form of words whatever. For Ordination being only a Miniſterial act of delegating that Office to another which was received from Chriſt, any thing that is ſufficient to expreſs this delegation, whether words or ſigns, doth ſufficiently do the thing. For if Forms be ſo neceſſary to Ordination, what is it that makes them ſo? It muſt be either the inſtitution of Chriſt, or the nature of the thing it ſelf; any other Reaſon for it I know not. If it be from the inſtitution

* Avadhah, *Tract.* 2. *cap.* 4. *Sect.* 12.

ſtitution of Chriſt, let us be but convinced of that and we have done. For in this caſe either to omit the Form, or alter in the leaſt from its firſt inſtitution, would make the whole performance culpable. But if there be no inſtitution of Chriſt for any ſuch Form, (as I have already abundantly demonſtrated that there is not) all the neceſſity of ſuch a Form muſt be from the nature of the thing it ſelf. Now if the nature of Ordination doth not neceſſarily require any ſuch Form, but that any of the Offices of the Church may be as well conferred by an outward Ceremony only, by publick inſtitution made ſignificant and expreſſive of the thing done; there appears no neceſſity for the uſe of any ſuch Forms at all, ſo as to invalidate thoſe Orders that are conferred without them. That which makes the Church of *Rome* ſo much inſiſt upon the Matter and Form of Ordination is, that they have made it a Sacrament; and they obſerving the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, and the Sacrament of Baptiſm, which are really Sacraments of Chriſts own inſtitution, to conſiſt each of them, as preſcribed in Scripture, of an outward ſign and a form of words annext, the former of which they call the matter, and the latter the form of the Sacrament, from hence they do infer that they are both eſſentially neceſſary to all thoſe other Rites, which they will have to be Sacraments alſo; and becauſe they find none ſuch inſtituted in Scripture for them, (as they themſelves acknowledge) that they may not be without them, introduce Matters and Forms (as they call them) of their own making. And hence it is that they talk ſo much of the Matter and Form of Orders, and will have both ſo eſſentially neceſſary to the conferring of them; whereas would they argue aright in this point, they ought not ſo much to have inferred the neceſſity of what they call Matter and Form for Ordination, from that it is a Sacrament, as that for this very reaſon it can be no Sacrament, becauſe it hath neither the one nor the other, by Divine inſtitution, belonging thereto. For the nature of a Sacrament, according to their own definitions, conſiſts in this, that it is an outward Ceremony conſiſting of things and words, inſtituted and enjoyned by Chriſt himſelf, with a promiſe of ſaving Grace annexed to the performance of it. And ſince nothing of this can be made out to us from Scripture, it doth from hence follow, that although Orders be enrold among the number of the Sacraments in the Church of *Rome*, it was never ſo in the Church of Chriſt. For where have we in Scripture any external ſign, where any Form of words commanded to be made uſe of in the Adminiſtration of Orders? Or where any promiſe of ſaving Grace annexed thereto. All that we find inſtituted in Scripture concerning this matter, is, that as Chriſt ſent the Apoſtles ſo they ſhould ſend others, and that none ſhould Preach except they were ſent; but as to the manner of this miſſion or ſending, nothing is at all inſtituted or preſcribed unto us in Holy Writ; but the whole of this is left to the Church, and thoſe chief Paſtors of it which have the Authority of giving thoſe Miſſions committed

mitted to them, ſo to order and appoint it according to the various circumſtances of times, places and things, as they ſhall judge will be moſt fitting, provided it be agreeable in all things to the Word of God, and ſufficiently declarative of the thing intended: And this the abovementioned *Arcudius*, an Eminent Doctor of the Church of *Rome*, plainly acknowledgeth: For in his Book *de Sacramentis*, *lib.* 6. *cap.* 4. he tells us, that Orders may be conferred by any manner of Rite, ſo it expreſs a will of delivering that Spiritual Power to the perſon Ordained. Some Examples indeed we have of Ordinations in Scripture, as when Chriſt Ordained his Apoſtles, and after, when the Apoſtles Ordained the ſeven Deacons, and the Church of *Antioch*, *Paul* and *Barnabas* to be the Apoſtles of the *Gentiles*, and the manner of theſe Ordinations is alſo deſcribed unto us, but no Precept is at all given us of this matter, or any thing in the leaſt commanded or enjoyned concerning it, much leſs any promiſe of ſaving Grace annexed thereto. The Popiſh Tranſlation of the New Teſtament indeed tells us of Grace given by the impoſition of hands, 1 *Tim.* 4. *v.* 14. and 2 *Tim.* 1. *v.* 6. but in thoſe places the word is not χαρις *Grace*, but χαρισμα *a Gift*, as our Tranſlation hath it; not the gracious working of the Holy Ghoſt in us, in order to Sanctification and Holineſs of Life, but only a gift freely given to qualifie and enable, in order to the performance of the Office conferred, and what thoſe gifts are you have deſcribed in the 12th Chapter of the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, where you find them either to be ordinary or extraordinary. The extraordinary gifts were ſuch as accompanied the Miniſtry of the Apoſtles, and firſt Preachers of the Goſpel, as being neceſſary to create belief in a World then totally infidel, as to thoſe things they taught; and theſe were the gift of working Miracles, the gift of divers Tongues, the gift of healing all manner of Diſeaſes, the gift of Prophecying, and ſuch like. The ordinary gifts are ſuch as have ever ſince been continued down in the Church to thoſe that are Legally called to the Adminiſtration of Divine things; as the Power of Teaching the Word, of Adminiſtring the Sacraments, of Bleſſing the People in the Name of God, of offering up acceptable Sacrifices of Praiſe and Prayer unto him for them, and ſuch like; and theſe are the χαρισματα, or gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, which were given by impoſition of hands in Ordination; and in order to theſe only is it that the Biſhop ſays therein, [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*] which Gifts do only impower and aſſiſt, in order to the performance of the Office confer'd, not unto Holineſs and Righteouſneſs of Life, wherein conſiſts that ſaving Grace whereby we are ſanctified unto Everlaſting Life; and are ſo far of themſelves alone from conducing any thing thereto in the perſons endowed with them, that we often find them conſiſting with the greateſt iniquities; for *Judas* * had them to the working of Miracles, caſting out of Devils, and healing all manner of Diſeaſes, that was the worſt of Tray-

* *Matt.* 10. *v.* 1. *Luk.* 9. *v.* 1. 6.

tors;

tors; and *Caiaphas* the High Prieſt of the *Jews*, although one of the wickedeſt of men, had alſo like gifts of the Holy Ghoſt given him with his Office; and by vertue thereof we find him making a moſt clear Propheſie of our Saviour, and the Redemption to be wrought by him for Mankind in dying for us, at the ſame time when he was acting the higheſt piece of Treaſon againſt him; for † the Scripture tells us, that being High Prieſt that year he Propheſied. And from all this which I have ſaid, it manifeſtly appearing that Orders is no Sacrament, there can lye no neceſſity from hence for any of thoſe Matters and Forms (as they call them) which the Church of *Rome* requires in order thereto; ſo as that the Adminiſtration ſhould be neceſſarily annexed to them (as that Church aſſerts) but that all the Holy Offices or Orders of the Church of Chriſt, whether of Biſhops, Prieſts or Deacons, may be conferred by the one of them alone, without the other, as well as by both together, when made ſufficiently declarative of the thing deſigned, or by any other like ſignificant Rite, which ſhall be appointed in order thereunto. For taking the adminiſtration of Holy Orders thus in the true nature and notion of the thing without reckoning it a Sacrament, it will appear to be no other then the delegating or tranſmitting from one Succeſſion to another, thoſe Offices which have by Divine Authority been inſtituted in the Church of Chriſt, for the miniſtring of the Holy things of God therein; and therefore there can remain nothing in them which may neceſſarily require any thing more to be done, to carry them down from one to another in a due and Legal Succeſſion, then what is practiced in all other Offices wherein one man ſucceeds another; but that they may in the ſame manner, by a perſon fully Authorized thereto, be validly and fully conferred by any Rite and Manner whatever, ſufficiently declarative of the thing intended; and whether it be done by an outward Ceremony alone, or a Form of words alone, or both together; either may be ſufficient, when either by common uſe or publick inſtitution, they have a ſignificancy given them to denote the thing deſigned.

† *John* 11. *v.* 51.

And thus far having treated of the Forms of Ordination uſed in the Church of *Rome*, I hope I have fully ſatisfied you that they are no ſuch eſſential immutable things, as you ſeem to be of opinion that they are But if thoſe Writers of that Church, which are ſo earneſt for this, had aſſerted it of the matter of Order, [*Impoſition of hands*] they would have had a much better plea on their ſide, becauſe it muſt undeniably be granted, not only from the Writings of the Antients, but alſo from Scripture it ſelf, that impoſition of hands from the very beginning of Chriſtianity, hath been always a Rite moſt conſtantly made uſe of in the conferring of Holy Orders. But as to this the Church of *Rome* hath nothing to cavil with us, it being as conſtantly uſed in all Proteſtant Churches as in theirs. And beſides herein they themſelves have moſt ſhamefully deviated from the antient practice of the Church, by

by introducing a new matter of their own invention, the delivery of the Sacred Veſſels to the perſon Ordained; a thing never practiced in any Church till brought into uſe by them, about ſeven hundred years ſince; yet this they are ſo zealous for in preference to the other, that of impoſition of hands, that they do not only, by the general received Doctrine of their Church, give it the preheminence as the prime and principal matter eſſential to the Sacrament, (as they call it) but abundance of them make that to be the only external ſign that is ſo, and reject the other, although moſt undeniably of Apoſtolical uſage, into the number only of thoſe * accidental Rites which belong to that adminiſtration. And this I mention only to let you ſee, that although thoſe men are ſo clamorous againſt us for altering the Ordinal at the Reformation, they only are guilty of that alteration herein which is really culpable, in that to introduce a new Rite or Matter (as they term it) of their own invention, they give little or no regard to that which is truly Apoſtolical, for ſo impoſition of hands muſt undeniably be allowed to be. But I intend not to make any diſpute as to this particular, having before ſaid, that Orders may be validly conferred without it, by any other manner ſufficiently expreſſive of the thing intended. But here I deſire to be underſtood that I hold it not juſtifiable for any Biſhop ſo to do, unleſs in ſome particular caſe, where there may be an extraordinary reaſon to warrant the alteration: Becauſe when a Rite hath been ſo generally received in the Church, and hath ſo venerable a ſtamp upon it, as that of Apoſtolick uſage; the Example is ſo enforcing as even to reach almoſt the very nature of a Precept to oblige us to do the ſame thing: But becauſe we find no Precept or Inſtitution in Scripture concerning this Rite, (as the Romaniſts themſelves acknowledge that there is not) we put it not into the eſſentials of Ordination, ſo as to judge null and void ſuch Orders as ſhall be conferred without it, but in this caſe admit the old and well known Rule, *quod fieri non debet factum valet*, that which ought not to be done is valid when done: For the Rite of impoſition of hands being of ſo antient and venerable uſe in the Church (as I have aforeſaid) I think it cannot be omitted, unleſs in ſome extraordinary caſe, (as I have mentioned) without a great fault both in him that ſhall give, and him that ſhall receive Orders without it. But however the Orders muſt be allowed to be good, notwithſtanding that omiſſion; becauſe our Saviour who commands the chief Paſtors of his Church to ſend others after them, to adminiſter in holy things, even as they were ſent, enjoyned herein only the miſſion it ſelf without preſcribing any thing to them about the manner of it; neither were his Holy Apoſtles after him directed by his Holy Spirit to leave any Rule or Precept to us, as to this particular: But it was left to the Governours of the Church to do herein, according as they ſhould ſee moſt fitting. And for many Ages after Chriſt there was no ſuch thing as a Uniform Ordinal in any Church, but the

* *Dominicus Soto, Silveſter, de Valentia, alliq.*

thing was left to diſcretion, as the manner of Conſecrating Churches with us, and every Biſhop uſed his own method herein, only impoſition of hands was always retained; but with ſuch different and various Forms of Prayers, Benedictions, and other Rites, as the Biſhop Ordaining thought moſt fitting to make uſe of; and from hence no doubt came all that variety of Ordinals which is to be found among thoſe *Morinus* hath publiſhed; for Uniformity either of Liturgies or Ordinals is of very late date, even in the Church of *Rome* it ſelf. In *England* down to the very time of the Reformation there were five different Liturgies, according to the different uſes of the Churches of *Sarum*, *Hereford*, *York*, *Bangor* and *Lincoln*; and in *Morinus* there is an Ordinal for the uſe of *England*, much differing from the reſt; and therefore it is no new thing for us to vary from the Church of *Rome* in this particular, even while we own'd its Uſurpations over us, how much ſoever we are now quarrelled at on this account, ſince we have been ſeparated from them. The ſum of all is, that there was nothing of conſtant uſe in Ordination, but Impoſition of hands; the Benedictions, Prayers, and other Rites that accompanied being for the moſt part differing, according to the different Churches in which they were uſed, and therefore if the Ordainer were a perſon fully authorized, and the perſon Ordained fully qualified for the Sacred Office to which he was admitted, we never meet with any that diſputed the manner of the Ordination: Neither do we find that ever a Controverſie was made in this matter to null and void the Orders of any Church, from any defect in their Ordinal, till the Church of *Rome* raiſed the preſent Cavil againſt us: For although different Churches in former times did much differ as to this, yet we find none ſo fond of their own Methods and Forms, as to condemn others that varied from them; but it was ever looked on as the right of every particular Church in this, to follow their own eſtabliſhments. And although the Romaniſts have in this the *Greek* Church as much differing from them as the Church of *England*, yet we find them not making any quarrel with them upon this account; but on the contrary, allowing them to make uſe of their own Ordinals, even after received into Communion with them; and that even in thoſe Churches which they have in *Rome* it ſelf, and were it not that the violence of their paſſion againſt us for our differing from them in other things, made them overlook their Reaſon in this, the ſame thing muſt have been allowed us alſo. But it hath happened to them in this as is uſual with ſuch as contend in a bad cauſe, that is, wanting all true Reaſons of oppoſition againſt us, were forced to lay hold of any thing that might ſeem to bear an appearance of it, without conſidering the inconſiſtencies which the charge bears even with their own Principles; but they having begun are bound in Honour to proceed, and I know no other reaſon they have of continuing this unreaſonable Cavil againſt us about the validity of our Orders, abundance of their own Divines being really aſhamed

of

of it, as you may ſee from the Teſtimonies I have already produced to you from ſome of them concerning this matter, who poſitively declare their Opinion to the contrary herein. And no doubt were they to begin the Controverſie anew with us, amongſt ſeveral other Articles of Oppoſition they have too raſhly taken up againſt us, this concerning the validity of our Orders would in the firſt place be totally ſuperſeded betwixt us.

But becauſe in anſwering what you objected concerning the Forms of Ordination, I have been led alſo to ſpeak of the Matter, Impoſition of hands, that I may leave nothing that I have ſaid liable to Objection, I think it requiſite a little further to explain my ſelf concerning this particular. Although there be ſome Doctors of the Church of *Rome* that hold Impoſition of hands only to be an accidental Rite, and the delivery of the Sacred Veſſels the ſole eſſential Matter of Orders; yet the moſt General receiv'd Opinion among them is, that they are both eſſential matters, but make the delivery of the Sacred Veſſels the moſt principal matter, as being that whereby they ſay is conferr'd the power of Order, enabling to conſecrate the Euchariſt, and offer the Sacrifice of the Maſs; whereas by the other impoſition of hands is only conferred the power of Juriſdiction, which they make to be by much the inferior and leſs noble part of the Sacerdotal Function; and in this Doctrine of theirs I think them guilty of a double Error: For,

1. Since Impoſition of Hands hath been of ſuch conſtant uſe in the Church of Chriſt from the beginning in all Ordinations, and hath been Conſecrated thereto by the practice of the Apoſtles themſelves, (as from Scripture is moſt evident) they detract from the Veneration which is due to ſo ancient a Rite, and to the Example of the holy Apoſtles, who uſed it alone without any other, by putting it in the ſecond place after a Rite of their own invention, and making it thus inferior thereto; I mean the delivery of the Sacred Veſſels, which doth not appear from any of their Ordinals or any other ancient Record of the Church, to have been in uſe among them above ſeven hundred years, as *Morinus* a Prieſt of their own makes it out unto us. But,

2. I think them as much in a miſtake on the other hand, by making this or any other Rite eſſential to this Adminiſtration, ſince there is no Divine Inſtitution eſtabliſhing any thing at all concerning it. That the Scriptures tell us not of any ſuch, the *Romaniſts* themſelves freely grant; but what they cannot make out from hence they would prove unto us by the Tradition of their Church; for by that they tell us it hath been delivered down from one Age to another, that both theſe Rites which they hold to be the eſſential matters of Prieſtly Ordination were inſtituted and commanded by Chriſt himſelf; and they pretend alſo to give us a Reaſon, as I have afore noted, why this Inſtitution ſhould be rather thus preſerved down to ſubſequent Ages by an unwritten Tradition than by the written Word; but this Tradition being moſt apparently falſe as to one of them, the delivery of the Sacred Veſſels (which

it's plain for a Thouſand years was never heard of in the Church, as I have ſhown) is by no means a ſufficient Teſtimony to be relied on for the other. That the Apoſtles ordained by impoſition of hands, and that all Churches herein followed their Example, is moſt certain: But that it is to be received as an eſſential to the adminiſtration in which it is uſed upon the account of a Divine Inſtitution we have no Authority for it, but from the later Writers of the Church of *Rome*, which is by no means ſufficient to make us ſubſcribe thereto. And if the Apoſtolical practice be urged on their ſide, the anſwer is moſt certain, that all things are not to be held to be of Divine Inſtitution which the Apoſtles did, or do they for this reaſon lay a neceſſary obligation upon the Church as ſuch, becauſe we have their Example for the practice of them. For their Example is not ſufficient to inferre a Divine Inſtitution for thoſe things which they did, where we have that alone without any precept unto us for the doing of them alſo, as from abundance of Inſtances in Scripture of things practiced by them, and now totally aboliſhed, may moſt apparently be made out unto you. And this way of arguing would inferre ſuch difficulties upon the *Romaniſts* themſelves, as they will never be able to anſwer: For waving other inſtances, to come to the particular now in hand, if impoſition of Hands in Ordination were on this account to be held for a Divine Inſtitution, what ſhall become of the ſo Generally receiv'd Axiom of the Church of *Rome*, ‖ *Summus Pontifex ſolo verbo poteſt facere & Sacerdotem & Epiſcopum*; That the Pope without impoſition of Hands, or any other Rite whatever, can make both a Prieſt and a Biſhop by ſpeaking the word only; ſo that if he ſay unto any one, be thou a Prieſt, or be thou a Biſhop, his ſaying ſo only without any further Ceremony ſhall be ſufficient fully and validly to confer either of the ſaid Offices: For the Pope is no more excuſed from any thing that is of Divine Inſtitution, than any other of his Communion; and I ſuppoſe none of their Doctors will ſay that he is. But that although in a High degree he Lords it over all, yet he is equally with all ſubject to the Laws of him whoſe Vicar he pretends to be. But if it be asked then that if there be no command of Chriſt for this Rite, nor any obligation from a Divine preſcript for the uſe of it, how came it from the beginning of Chriſtianity to be the practice of all the Apoſtles, and what other reaſon can be given for ſo early and general obſervance of it? To this I anſwer, That it was a Rite which was received in conformity to the ancient uſe of it in the *Jewiſh* Church to the ſame purpoſe: And that I may give you ſatisfaction herein, I ſhall trace the thing to its firſt Original, and give you a thorough account of it; and in ſo doing, I hope I ſhall not only anſwer the preſent objection, but alſo clear the way for the removing of all thoſe other difficulties which you have raiſed to your ſelf about this particular.

‖ *Gygas cum DD ab eo citat. Q. 8. de perſ. n. 3.*

The

The Publick Service of God among the *Jews* was twofold: First, That of the Temple; and Secondly, That of the Synagogue. That of the Temple consisting only of Sacrifices, Oblations, and the Ceremonies belonging thereto, which were all Typical Representations of the Grand Sacrifice of Christ our Saviour, once to be offered for all. When he had offered this Sacrifice by dying on the Cross for us, they all receiv'd their Completion, and thenceforth became totally Abolished. But the Service of the Synagogue not consisting of Ceremonial Observances, but of the Moral Duties of Prayer, Praise, Thanksgiving, and in Exhortations and Instructions to the obeying of Gods Holy Will and Commandments, to which there is a natural and perpetual obligation, was still from the *Jewish* Oeconomy which ceased continued on to the Christian that followed after it in its stead; and that as far as the nature of things would bear, according to the same Rules of Discipline, Order and Practice also as formerly; that there being as little variation as possible, as to the observance of those Duties in the new Oeconomy, from the former practice of them under the old, the *Jews* who were beyond all other people of the Earth most tenacious of the Traditions and Practices of their Forefathers, might be the easier induced to joyn themselves to the Christian Worship, and with less difficulty be Converted to the Truth thereof. For the Holy Apostles being primarily sent to the lost Sheep of the House of *Israel*, did as wise Master-builders of the Church of Christ well consider this, and therefore in forming of the outward order of its worship, and the Manner and Discipline of its Government, conform'd themselves to the pattern of the Synagogue, to which it succeeded as far as the Law of the Gospel, and the nature of that Oeconomy they were then establishing would admit; and hence among many other things came the name of Elders or Presbyters, (for the later is the same in *Greek* what the former is in *English*) and the manner of Ordaining them by Imposition of Hands to be introduced into the Church of Christ: Not that there was any Divine precept concerning either the one or the other, but that both were continued in imitation of what was afore practiced in the Church of the *Jews*. For therein those that had the Government of Ecclesiastical Affairs, were called זקנים *Zekenim*, Presbyters or Elders. Of their first appointment to this Office we read *Num.* 11. where *Moses* complaining that the charge of the whole Congregation was too heavy for him, Seventy of the Wisest and Gravest of the People were appointed to be his Assistants herein, and to bear part of the Duty with him in Instructing and Governing the people according to the Law which God had given unto them; and in order hereto the Spirit of Wisdom and Prophesie rested on them, and these constituted the grand Ecclesiastical Council of that Nation called the *Sanedrim*, which determined all Controversies concerning the Law of God and directed to all other Establishments for the promoting of his Honour and Worship among them. But besides these there were

other

other Elders also in every particular City, which had there the same charge upon them for that district, which the others had for the whole Nation, and were those which constituted the Presbytery of that place to take care of the Service of God in the Synagogues, to minister in all the Duties of Holy Worship therein, to instruct the people in the Law of God, to exhort to the observance of it, to give judgement according thereto in all Controversies, and to exercise the power of binding and loosing, in declaring what was Lawful and what was Unlawful to be done when any doubt or difficulty required their determination herein, to correct such as transgressed the Law, to Excommunicate the Incorrigible, and also to receive them again by Absolution when penitent, and to admit Proselytes into the Church by Baptism. And in order to qualifie them for these Duties, there were Schools or Universities, in which they were bred up as *Paul* at the feet of *Gamaliel* (the then President of the *Sanedrim*, and chief Professor of Divinity in the University of *Jerusalem*) to understand the Law of God, and all other parts of Scripture, and to know the determinations of the Learned, which had been afore given concerning all points of doubt or difficulty occurring in any part thereof, and when they had gone thorough such a Course of Study and Proficiency as rendred them sufficiently versed herein, they were then ordained Elders or Presbyters by imposition of Hands, and thereby authorized to all those Duties which I have afore mention'd to belong to that Office; and this imposition of hands was then understood in the same manner as now with us to give the Assistance of Gods Holy Spirit for the performance of them. And thus the *Hebrew* Doctors tell us that the Seventy Elders were Ordained by *Moses*, and that at the performance of this Rite it was that the Spirit of Prophecy rested on them; of which is mention *Numb.* 11. *v.* 25. But in the Ordination of *Joshua* to be the Chief of them after the decease of *Moses*, the Scriptures themselves expressly tell us, that it was done by Imposition of Hands, and that thereon the Spirit of God rested on him; *Num.* 27. *v.* 18. and *Deut.* 34. *v.* 9. The *Hebrew* Doctors are very large and express concerning all these particulars, and frequent mention is made of them in their Writings.

Maimonides in Tract. *Sanhdrim* cap. 4.

The words of *Maimonides*, the most eminent of them, are as followeth. *Whether the Elders or Presbyters were Members of the great* Sanhedrim, *or whether they were Members of the lesser Councils, or Presbyteries which were constituted in every City, or whether they were of the Triumvirate only appointed to judge of Causes between man and man, it was necessary that every one of them should be ordained by Imposition of Hands by others which had been so ordained before him. And* Moses *our Master so ordained* Joshua *by the Imposition of his Hands; for it is written* Numb. 27. v. 23. And he laid his hand upon him and gave him a charge. *And so also* Moses *ordained the Seventy Elders and the Holy Spirit rested on them; and those Elders created others, and they again others, and so*

it

it hath been found that one hath been Ordained by another through all Ages, up to the time of the Sanhedrim of Joshua, *and the Sanhedrim of* Moses.

And this being the ſtate of the Elders or Presbyters of the *Jewiſh* Church, and the manner of their admiſſion to that Office, (as I have deſcribed) it doth anſwer in ſo many particulars what was after eſtabliſhed in the Church of Chriſt, as makes it moſt clear what I have afore ſaid, that the one was a pattern to the other herein, and that all things of this nature, which were introduced into the latter, were by imitation tranſlated from the former; and this is the ſenſe of abundance of Learned Men that treat of this matter, as well Romaniſts as Proteſtants; they all holding, that the Holy Apoſtles, to make the change the more eaſie from the old Oeconomy to the new, in forming the outward Order and Diſcipline of the Church, did not make all things new therein, but borrowed from the Synagogue of the *Jews*, as many of its uſages as could be accommodated thereto. And of all thoſe things, of which this may be ſaid, it is of none more manifeſt than of the name of Presbyters, and the manner of Ordaining them by impoſition of hands, that they both came this way into the Church of Chriſt. And an eaſie entrance was made them thereto by the ſimilitude of the things themſelves; the Chriſtian Preſbyter being the ſame in the Church of Chriſt that the *Jewiſh* was in the Synagogue; the duties in which they officiated very little differing, and the end for which impoſition of hands was made uſe of in their Ordination thereto, totally the ſame; as from what hath been afore ſaid may ſufficiently appear: For what hath the office of a Chriſtian Presbyter more than what I have afore deſcribed to belong to a Presbyter or Elder in the Synagogue of the *Jews*, excepting only the adminiſtring of the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, which anſwered not to any thing of the Synagogue, but to the Paſchal Feaſt; which was a Service totally appropriated to the Temple, and the City of *Jeruſalem* in which it ſtood. And what other end is deſigned by impoſition of hands in the Ordination of a Chriſtian Presbyter, but the giving of the Holy Ghoſt? the ſame which I have told you was alſo imported by the ſame Ceremony in the Ordination of a Presbyter for the Synagogue only, it was given in the Chriſtian Church in a larger degree then in the *Jewiſh*, and alſo for a more excellent miniſtration, the one being derived only from *Moſes*, for the teaching of the Law, and the other from Chriſt our Lord, for the preaching of his Goſpel, and the adminiſtring of all the benefits thereof unto Everlaſting Life. And thus far I hope I have made it clear, how this Ceremony of impoſition of hands, made uſe of in our Ordinations, came into the Church of Chriſt, that is, not by any Divine Law or Precept from our Saviour, but only by imitation from what was afore practiced in the Synagogue of the *Jews*: But however ſince we find it introduced by the Apoſtles themſelves, and in all Ordinations practiced by them from the beginning, who were in ſo extraordinary a manner guided by the Holy Spirit of God in

all

all that they did of this nature; this is ſufficient to infer a Divine Approbation of the uſe thereof, although not a Divine Inſtitution perpetually obligatory thereto; and therefore we cannot, without being guilty of the greateſt raſhneſs, vary from it to any invention of our own, for which we can have no ſuch aſſurance; and this with the apt ſignificancy which the Ceremony it ſelf hath of the thing intended, no doubt hath been the reaſon that it hath ever ſince been continued in the Church of Chriſt down to this time; there being no Church or Sect of Chriſtians (that I know of) which think any Ordination at all neceſſary, that do not make uſe of this Ceremony therein. Now the manner how Orders were firſt adminiſtred hereby, we gather from Scripture to be thus; when any perſons were made choice of to officiate in any of the Holy Offices of the Church, whether of Biſhop, Prieſt or Deacon; Firſt, God Almighty was ſought to in their behalf by a ſolemn Faſt, to which the Ember weeks do now anſwer, and then the Congregation being met, the Ordainer, whether one of the Apoſtles themſelves, or of the Biſhops that ſucceeded them, having by a Prayer particular for that purpoſe, recommended the perſon to be Ordained to the mercy and favour of God, that he would be pleaſed to accept of him to that Holy Function to which he was ſet apart, and impart unto him ſuch a meaſure of his Gifts and Graces as might fully enable him to all the Duties thereof; then as the proper Miniſter of God, by his Divine appointment, for this purpoſe, laid his hands upon him for his receiving all that which had in his behalf been thus prayed for; it being by this Miniſterial act, as it were by the hand of God himſelf, reached out unto him; and this was always looked upon as the very act whereby the Office was given, and the full completion of that adminiſtration whereby any were admitted thereto, and for ſeveral Ages after we find no other Ceremony uſed therein. But Impoſition of hands alone was all along looked on as the ſole Ceremonial act whereby the Office was conferred, whether it were of Biſhop, Prieſt, or Deacon; it being thereto as the Seal to the Patent by which they acted in their Miniſtry, and the application thereof that which impowered them to all the duties of it. And for this reaſon, among the *Greeks*, Ordination and Impoſition of hands are ſignified by the ſame word; and alſo in the Writings of the Apoſtles themſelves, we have inſtances hereof, *Acts* 14. *v.* 23. and 2 *Cor.* 8. *v.* 19. in both theſe places the word which by the Romaniſts themſelves is Tranſlated to Ordain, is in the Original Greek χειροτονῆν, which properly ſignifies to lay on hands, which ſufficiently imports, that in that Ceremony the whole act of Ordination was underſtood to conſiſt, without any of thoſe imperative Forms, which you ſeem to lay ſo much ſtreſs upon, we having no Authority in the leaſt to make it out unto us that any ſuch were at all in uſe for near a thouſand years after Chriſt, as I have already ſhown: Neither is there any ſuch neceſſity for them (as you urge) to declare the intent of the

the Ceremony, or which of the different Orders of the Church it is which is conferred thereby in Ordination ; ſeeing this may be as well manifeſted by a publick declaration to the people in the beginning of the adminiſtration, and alſo in the ſubſequent prayers, which were offered up unto God in behalf of the perſon to be Ordained, for his accepting of him to the Office, and his imparting to him his Divine Gifts, to enable him to the Duties of it, as it is evident that it was done by both theſe ways in the Primitive Church, without any ſuch Forms as you think ſo neceſſary thereto ; for to expreſs the thing the more plainly to you ; when a Faſt had been appointed in order to the Ordination of a Presbyter, when the Congregation being met, the end of that meeting was declared, for the Ordaining of ſuch an one there preſent to be a Presbyter, and when by particular Prayers he had been recommended to God for his imparting to him his Gifts and Graces for that Office, (as was the ancient manner of Ordination) after all this had been done, when the hands of the Biſhop and the Presbytery were laid on him for the conferring of the Office, certainly there needed no new declaration to expreſs the end for which it was done. And that this was anciently the practice of the Church of *Rome* it ſelf, thus to Ordain by Impoſition of hands, without any ſuch Forms annexed ; we have a moſt evident proof from their own Ordinal, it being ſtill thus retained therein : For in the Roman Ordinal, Impoſition of hands in the Ordination of a Prieſt is twice adminiſtred ; the laſt time indeed it hath a Form annexed, the ſame almoſt which we uſe ; [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*, &c.] But of the firſt the Rubrick of the Ordinal ſays ; " *Pontifex ſtans ante faldiſtorium ſuum cum Mitrâ &* " *nulla oratione nullove cantu præmiſſis imponit ſimul utramque manum ſuper* " *caput cujuſlibet Ordinandi ſucceſſivè nihil dicens, idemq; faciunt poſt eum om-* " *nes Sacerdotes qui adſunt* ; i. e. *The Biſhop ſtanding before his Faldſtool with his Mitre on his head, without any Prayer or Hymn premiſed, puts both his hands ſucceſſively on the head of every one to be Ordained, without ſpeaking any thing at all, and after him all the Prieſts that are preſent do the ſame thing.* Now that this Impoſition of hands, which is thus adminiſtred in the Ordination of a Presbyter, with ſilence, and without any Form of words at all ſpoken at the doing of it, is the true and antient Impoſition of hands which they have received down by Tradition from the former Ages of the Church, and by which alone the Order is conferred, and not the other, Impoſition of hands after adminiſtred, I have theſe Arguments to make it moſt manifeſt unto you.

Firſt, Becauſe this later Impoſition of hands with the Form of words with which it is adminiſtred, are both of them but lately introduced into their Church, they being to be found in none of their Ordinals, till about four hundred years ſince ; or do any of their Ritualiſts, which are of ancienter date, make the leaſt mention of them ; whereas the other Im-

poſition of hands, is that which all of them make very particular expreſſion of.

Secondly, The true and ancient Impoſition of hands in the Ordination of a Presbyter was always adminiſtred by the Biſhop, with the Impoſition of the hands of the Presbytery alſo joyned therewith, and this not only the Decrees of Councils, but the Practice and Examples of the Holy Apoſtles themſelves do direct to: But the Presbytery in the Roman Ordinal do no where lay on their hands with the Biſhop on the perſon to be Ordained to the Prieſtly Function, but in this firſt Impoſition of hands only, which is adminiſtred without any Form at all, in perfect ſilence; and therefore this alone muſt be that Impoſition of hands which confers the Order, and this even the Council of *Trent* it ſelf doth plainly enough ſay. For in the 14th Seſſion and 3d Chapter of Extream Unction, treating of the proper Miniſters of that Rite or Sacrament, as they call it, do there declare that they muſt be, "*Aut Epiſcopi aut Sacerdotes ab ipſis rite Ordinati per Impoſitionem manuum* "*Preſbyterii*; i. e. *Either Biſhops or Prieſts regularly Ordained by them with the Impoſition of the hands of the Preſbytery.* From whence it follows, that if thoſe only are regularly made Prieſts who are ſo Ordained by the Biſhop with the Impoſition of the hands of the Presbytery (as is here aſſerted) that Impoſition of hands alone in the Roman Ordinal, muſt be the Rite which confers the Order, where the Presbyters as well as the Biſhop bear their part in the adminiſtration, by laying on their hands alſo, which is no where done in all that Office, but in that firſt Impoſition of hands only, which is adminiſtred in perfect ſilence. And for thoſe reaſons (*a*) *Morinus* and (*b*) *Habertus*, both Prieſts of the Roman Church, and Eminently Learned above moſt other of that Communion, in the points we now treat of, do plainly aſſert that this Impoſition of hands is the eſſential matter of Orders, and (*c*) *Merbeſius* a later Writer, and ſeveral others alſo of that Church do aſſent with them herein. And I hope Arguments and Authorities of this nature may be ſufficient to convince you that there is no ſuch neceſſity for thoſe Forms in Ordination which you ſo much contend for; or that Impoſition of hands is altogether a dumb and inſignificant ſign, when adminiſtred without them, as your Paper aſſerts; ſince by what hath been ſaid it plainly appears, that even in the Church of *Rome* it ſelf, for which you ſo earneſtly argue in this particular, the Impoſition of hands which confers the Order of Prieſthood, is even that which is thus adminiſtred in perfect ſilence, without any Form of words at all joyned therewith.

(*a*) *Lib.* 3. *Exercit.* 7. *cap.* 2.
(*b*) Page 224.
(*c*) *De Sacr. Ord. D.* 6. *g.* 52.

But becauſe you lay ſo much ſtreſs upon the Matter and Form of Orders, as if without being exact in theſe, no Ordination can be fully and validly adminiſtred. I think it proper alſo to acquaint you, that all that Divinity concerning

cerning the Matter and Form of Orders, which the Schoolmen make ſo much pudder about, and is at preſent from them made ſo much uſe of in this Controverſie by our Adverſaries againſt us, is totally of late invention; there being nothing at all of it either in Scripture, or any of the Writings of the Ancients for above twelve hundred years after Chriſt, the very names of Matter and Form of Orders being till then totally unknown. But about the year 1250. the Philoſophy of *Ariſtotle*, which makes the ſubſtance or eſſence of all things to conſiſt of Matter and Form, being tranſlated out of *Arabick* into *Latin*, was with great greedineſs received by the Schoolmen, and ſoon incorporated by them into all their Divinity; and thenceforth they taking him for their Text, equally with the Scriptures themſelves, and according to his method in the definition of things aſcribing to each its Matter and its Form, introduced theſe terms alſo into the Doctrine of their Sacraments; and obſerving theſe to conſiſt of an outward Sign or Ceremony, and a form of words ſpoken at the Adminiſtration of it, for the ſake of the agreement or ſimilitude which is between the word *formula*, a form of words, and the word *forma*, which ſignifieth the *Ariſtotelical* form, made this form of words to be the eſſential Form, and the outward Ceremony the eſſential Matter which makes up the whole nature and eſſence of every Sacrament; and from hence it is that the matter and form of Orders (which they make to be one of their Sacraments) became firſt talked of among Divines; and all that heap of Rubbiſh which the Schoolmen and thoſe that follow them have built hereupon, and no better foundation then this have you for making any form of words ſpoken in Ordination to be eſſential thereto. Had our Saviour indeed inſtituted any form of words to be ſpoken at the Adminiſtration of the outward Rite, as he did in Baptiſme, then I confeſs that Inſtitution would have made it eſſential thereto and the whole would have been void and null without it. However ſuppoſing Orders a Sacrament, it could not be the eſſential Form thereof, for that only can be the eſſential Form of a thing which gives it its determinate Eſſence, and actually and ultimately conſtitutes it to be what it is, and therefore nothing elſe can be the eſſential form of a Sacrament, but that alone which actually gives it the nature and eſſence of a Sacrament; which no form of words can do, for if we conſider in either of the Sacraments that are truely and undoubtedly ſuch, the outward viſible ſign, and the Form of words alone, they can make nothing of themſelves but a liveleſs inſignificant Ceremony, unleſs ſomething elſe be taken in to give the eſſence and nature of a Sacrament thereto. In truth therefore, as well the Form of words as the outward ſign are both of them of the matter of the Sacrament; and it is only the relation and conformity which both muſt have to the Inſtitution of our Saviour with the concurrence of the Divine Grace according to the promiſe made in the inſtitution, which can make any Sacramental Adminiſtration to be truly and eſſentially ſuch. For no outward

viſible ſign with any form of words whatever, unleſs it hath a Divine Inſtitution whereto to refer, and bears with it an exact conformity thereto, can ever arrive to the true nature and eſſence of a Sacrament; and therefore ſuppoſing Orders to be a Sacrament of the new Law, as our Adverſaries would have, and that there was a Divine Inſtitution, not only for the outward ſign, but alſo for the form of words made uſe of in the conferring of them, yet it can never be ſaid that the form of words only, without any further reſpect, can give that determinate eſſence to the Sacrament as actually and ultimately to conſtitute it to be a Sacrament, (which is the nature of every eſſential form to do, in reſpect of the thing to which it belongs) and conſequently can never be the eſſential form thereof. And from hence you may plainly ſee, that all which our Adverſaries ſay of the eſſential form of Orders, and on which from them you ſo much inſiſt on, hath neither Scripture, Antiquity or Reaſon for its ſupport; but is totally grounded on no other foundation then the Philoſophy of *Ariſtotle*, and the miſtakes and dotages of the Schoolmen built thereon.

As to what you ſay concerning the eſſential form being contained in the Prayers of the *Roman* Ordinal, and that therefore before the imperative forms were added, Impoſition of Hands and Prayers were ſufficient with them for the conferring of Orders; but cannot be with us, becauſe in none of the Prayers of our Ordinal, this eſſential Form is contained. I Anſwer, If by the eſſential Form you mean thoſe very ſame words ſpoken by the Biſhop at the adminiſtring of the outward Rite or Matter as they call it, which the generality of the *Romiſh* Church call the form of Orders, I deny that they are contained in any of their Prayers, and if you think they are, you ſhould have told me in which.

But Secondly, If by the eſſential Form you mean no more than words in the Prayers ſignifying the Office conferr'd (which I ſuppoſe muſt be all that you mean thereby, if you mean any thing that is ſenſe) then I anſwer, that the prayers in our Ordinal do as fully contain that which you call the eſſential Form of Orders as any in the *Roman* Ordinal can be ſaid to do. And although you will not allow this of the Prayer immediately before impoſition of hands, or of that which follows immediately after in the Ordination of a Prieſt, yet you cannot deny it of the Collect for the occaſion, where it is moſt proper to be looked for; for that is as followeth: *Almighty God, Giver of all good things, who by thy Holy Spirit haſt appointed divers Orders of Miniſters in the Church, mercifully behold theſe thy Servants now called to the Office of Prieſthood, and repleniſh them ſo with the truth of thy Doctrine, and adorn them with innocency of Life, that both by word and good Example they may faithfully ſerve thee in this Office, to the glory of thy Name, and the Edification of thy Church, through the merits of Jeſus Chriſt.* And if you look over all the prayers of the *Roman* Ordinal, I think you cannot find in any of them the Office

Office of a Prieſt more expreſly mention'd than in this: And therefore I hold ſtill to my Inference, that if the Prayers with impoſition of hands may be ſufficient for the conferring of the order of Prieſthood in the *Roman* ordinal, this muſt be alſo ſufficient in ours. And I cannot poſſibly ſee what farther you can object againſt this, unleſs it be that the Prayer I have mention'd goeth before the Rite of impoſition of Hands in our Ordinal, whereas you may perchance think that it ought to come after, rightly to anſwer the end for which I urge it. But if you pleaſe to conſider thoſe paſſages of Scripture which tell us of the manner of ordaining practiced by the Holy Apoſtles, as it is alwayes expreſſed in them to be done by Prayer and Impoſition of hands, ſo alſo ſhall you find that Prayer was firſt, and Impoſition of hands after: So *Acts* 6. *v.* 6. in their Ordaining of the ſeven Deacons, it is ſaid, *that when they had prayed they laid their hands on them*; and ſo *Acts* 13. *v.* 3 of the Ordination of *Paul* and *Barnabas* to be the Apoſtles of the *Gentiles*, *When they had faſted and prayed, and laid their hands upon them, they ſent them away*; which paſſages plainly evidence unto us, that their method of Ordaining was firſt by Prayer, in the name of the Church, to Conſecrate the perſon unto God for the Office to which he was ſet apart; and then, as in Gods ſtead, according to the authority they had received from him, in order hereunto by Impoſition of hands to receive him to this Office, and confer the power thereof upon him, and that this was the completion of the whole adminiſtration made uſe of in this matter. And although *Acts* 14. *v.* 23. it is ſaid of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, *when they had Ordained them Elders or Preſbyters in every City, and had prayed with faſting*; yet we are to underſtand what is here laſt placed to have been firſt done, it being a thing very uſual with the Sacred as well as other Writers, while they relate matters of fact, not always to obſerve the exact order in which they were done, as from many inſtances in Scripture may be made appear unto you; and that this place is ſo to be underſtood, we have the *Rhemiſts* themſelves on our ſide, who in their notes on this place plainly tell us, that the Faſting and Prayers here mentioned were preparatives to Holy Orders.

In the next place you quarrel with me for miſreciting your words, which I confeſs is a great fault, if I am guilty of it, and would be contrary to that exact ſincerity with which I ever deſire to deal with all men, eſpecially in matters of Religion: But having carefully reviewed both mine own and your Papers, I can ſee no reaſon for this charge upon me. In my Anſwer to your firſt Paper, I obſerved that the grand defect which our Adverſaries charge our Orders with, is for omitting this Form in the Prieſtly Ordination, [*Receive thou Authority to offer Sacrifice unto God, and to Celebrate Maſs both for the Living and the Dead*] which I told you could not be an eſſential defect, becauſe this Form it ſelf was a novel addition, and not uſed in the Church of *Rome* it ſelf for near a thouſand years after Chriſt. To this you Anſwer in

your

your ſecond Paper in theſe words; *Although they have added that to theirs of offering Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead, yet in regard they do before in their Ordinal expreſly give all Prieſtly power which we did not, the other is but an inſtruction to let them know what power they had received, and for what they were to make uſe of it, by vertue of that all Prieſtly power expreſly given them before.* From which words, in Anſwer to what you charge me with, I have theſe things to ſay.

Firſt, That this being deſigned to Anſwer what I before ſaid in reference to the Form; [*Receive power to offer Sacrifice to God, and celebrate Maſs both for the Living and the Dead*] I ſuppoſe no one that ſhould read your Paper but would underſtand your abovementioned words therein to be a conceſſion of the whole of it to be a novel additional in the Roman Ordinal; and if it be not ſo, your Anſwer will by no means ſeem pertinent to the thing objected.

Secondly, Whereas you limit your conceſſion to the later part of the abovementioned Form only, and ſay you did only grant, *for the Celebrating of Maſs for the Living and the Dead*, that it was within theſe five hundred years firſt expreſſed in the Roman Ordinal, but not for *offering Sacrifice to God*, your own words above recited ſhow this to be moſt falſe; for there you ſay, [*Although they had added that to theirs of offering Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead*, &c.] which plainly expreſſeth the novel addition to be of *offering Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead*, and not of *Celebrating Maſs only*. And this I think is ſufficient not only to clear my ſelf from being guilty of that miſreciting which you charge me with, but alſo to retort it upon your ſelf; who it is plain, to fix this charge upon me have falſified and baſely prevaricated about your own words.

And whereas you ſay you are aſſured, that the *offering of Sacrifice to God* was ever expreſſed in the Roman Ordinal, and that the *Celebrating Maſs for the Living and the Dead*, was all along before the practice of the Church. I Anſwer.

Firſt, That if by Sacrifice you mean a true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice, as the Church of *Rome* now holds, whoever it was that hath aſſured you that the Ordinals of the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity ever gave a Prieſt power of offering any ſuch, hath abuſed you with a moſt groſs falſity, and baſely ſlandered the Primitive Church, in charging ſuch an impiety upon them. And

Secondly, As to *Celebrating Maſs for the Living and the Dead*; it is a cheat, which the innocent and pure times of Chriſtianity could never be guilty of; for it is an impoſture of their own invention, cunningly deviſed by them to get Money, and of no earlier date then their new found Regions of Purgatory, on which it depends, the one being a Brat of the other, and both without any the leaſt right or title to give them a Legitimation among the true and genuine Doctrines of Jeſus Chriſt. But thoroughly to handle

theſe

theſe particulars would be to deſert the ſubject in hand to run into other Queſtions; and therefore I ſhall ſay no more of them at preſent, but that I ſhall be ready to make them out unto you whenſoever you ſhall deſire.

And whereas you put me upon the proof of what I ſaid, that the Learneſt of the Roman Communion hold, that the laſt imperative words ſpoken at the laſt Impoſition of hands, [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*, &c.] are the alone eſſential Form whereby the Orders of Prieſthood are conferred, and expreſs your ſelf in a manner concerning it, implying as if I had told you more than I can make out, it lies upon me to do my ſelf right, as well as to give you ſatisfaction in making good what I have ſaid in this particular, and I aſſure you I want not Authorities enough in order hereunto: For *Bonaventure* in his 4th. Book (*a*) on the Sentences, plainly ſaith it: And ſo doth alſo *Petrus Sotus*, in his Book *de Inſtitutione Sacerdotum* (*b*); both of them making Impoſition of Hands with theſe words, [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*, &c.] the only eſſential Matter and Form of Prieſtly Ordination: And *Vaſquez* (*c*) thus underſtands them as excluding all other Matter and Form to be eſſential thereto. And moſt expreſs to this purpoſe are the words of *Becanus*, an eminent Jeſuit, and one that particularly bent his Fury againſt the Church of *England*: For ſpeaking of the twofold Ceremony made uſe of in Prieſtly Ordination, the Delivery of the Sacred Veſſels, with this form of words, [*Receive power to offer Sacrifice*, &c.] and Impoſition of Hands with this form [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*, &c.] (*d*) he concludes that the later only is eſſential to the Sacrament (as he calls it) and that the former is no more than an accidental Rite belonging thereto. And that this muſt neceſſarily follow from ſuch other Doctrines as they hold, I ſhall hereafter have a more particular occaſion to make out unto you, when I come to treat of that which I have in my former papers promiſed you, and which you ſo much call upon me to give you ſatisfaction in; that is, the ſufficiency of our Forms to confer all Prieſtly Power on the Perſons ordained by them. And to this alſo, I ſhall refer the conſideration of what you ſay in the two next Paragraphs, as being the place moſt proper for it.

(a) *Diſtinct.* 24. *Part.* 2. *Art.* 1. *Queſt.* 4.

(b) *Lect.* 5. *de Sacramento Ordinis.*

(c) *In tertiam Thomæ, Diſput.* 239. *cap.* 2.

(d) *De Sacramentis, cap.* 26. *Quæſt.* 4.

What you tell me in the next place after concerning Epiſcopal Ordination, is all prevarication: In my firſt paper to you I proved the validity of our Form for Epiſcopal Ordination by the ſame reaſon by which *Vaſquez* proves it for the Church of *Rome*, and in your anſwer you plainly allow it to be good and fully grant that this Form [*Take the Holy Ghoſt*, &c.] made uſe of in our old Ordinal for Epiſcopal Ordination may be ſufficient alone for that purpoſe, and aſſign this reaſon for it, becauſe a Biſhop in his Ordination doth not receive any new Character, but hath only that power and cha-

racter

racter further extended which was afore virtually in him from his Prieſthood. But then you tell me, This is nothing to the Point between us, that being not of the Epiſcopal Office, but of the Prieſthood only, which you think our Forms not ſufficient to confer. But now in your anſwer to what I replyed thereto, you deny all this which you have ſaid. For you tell me, Firſt, That you did not allow our Form of Epiſcopal Ordination to be ſufficiently perfect: And Secondly, That you did not ſay, that a Biſhop did not receive a new character, but only in the perſon of *Vaſquez*, and that this is not your opinion; but how much you falſify and prevaricate in ſaying this, your own words (to which I refer you) are an undeniable evidence againſt you, be who will judge between us in this matter. But be it ſo as you will have it, this will not however ſerve your turn. For though you will not allow the Form of our Epiſcopal Ordination to be good, yet there is no *Roman* Catholick but muſt; and what you pretend to ſay in the perſon of *Vaſquez*, is not *Vaſquez*'s opinion, but plain the contrary.

And Firſt, I ſay, All *Roman* Catholicks muſt allow the form of our Epiſcopal Ordination to be good, becauſe it contains therein the whole of theirs; and therefore if theirs be good, ours muſt be ſo alſo. For the Form of Epiſcopal Ordination in the *Roman* Ordinal is, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, i. e. *Take the Holy Ghoſt*; which very words are alſo in ours, and although there are other words added after, yet theſe cannot be ſaid to detract from the perfection of the Form, but abundantly to add thereto, as expreſſing an Exhortation to the duties of the office, for which the ordained receives the Holy Ghoſt in the very words of the Holy Apoſtle St. *Paul* to *Timothy*, whom he had afore by like giving of the Holy Ghoſt, ordained a Biſhop. *Hallier* *, I confeſs, makes mention alſo of the delivery of the Book of the Goſpels in Epiſcopal Ordination, to be an eſſential Matter; and theſe words ſpoken at the doing of it [*Receive the Goſpel, and go preach to the people committed to thy Charge, for God is able to encreaſe unto thee his Grace, who liveth and reigneth to all Eternity*] to be an eſſential Form; that is, a partial eſſential Form, which with the other, as a partial eſſential Form alſo, makes up the whole eſſence of that Ordination; but he propoſeth this only as an opinion which may ſeem probable without citing any Authority to make it out or naming any other Writer on his ſide to back him herein; and in truth I know not of any that do, there being none that I have met with who aſſign the Matter and Form of this Adminiſtration, but agree with *Armilla Major* and ‖ *Vaſquez* herein; who ſay, That Impoſition of Hands is the alone Matter of Epiſcopal Ordination; and theſe words [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*] the alone Form; and that in the applying this Matter and this Form together, the Sacrament doth conſiſt. But allow it to be as *Hallier* propoſeth, that the delivery of the

* *De Sacris Electionibus & ordinationibus. pag.* 443.

‖ *Vaſquez in tertiam Thomæ diſput.* 240. *n.* 58.

the Book of the Goſpels is a partial eſſential Matter, and the words ſpoken at the doing of it in the *Roman* Ordinal, a partial eſſential Form; and that this Rite as well as the other muſt concur to make up the true eſſence and perfection of Epiſcopal Ordination; yet even as to this, our Ordinal will be as perfect as theirs; for with us alſo, not only the Book of the Goſpels, but the whole Bible is delivered by the Ordainers to the Biſhop Ordained: And although our form ſpoken at the doing of it be not exactly the ſame with that in the *Roman* Ordinal, yet it includes the whole ſum and ſubſtance of it in other words, (which is all that they themſelves require to make a form ſufficient) and not only this, but alſo in a much more perfect and fuller manner expreſſeth the whole intent of that Ceremony than the other doth: And therefore after all that can be ſaid in this matter, whatſoever cavil an Adverſary may make againſt the form of our Prieſtly Ordination, there is none the leaſt pretence or colour in our Epiſcopal Ordination on this account as much as to ſuggeſt an exception.

And Secondly, As to the opinion of *Vaſquez*, in whoſe perſon you pretend it was that you ſaid that a Biſhop in his Ordination doth not receive any new Character, but hath only that Power and Character further extended which was afore virtually in him as a Prieſt; it is plain he ſays no ſuch thing, but aſſerts quite the contrary: For his words are in *Tertiam Thomæ Diſput.* 240. *c.* 5. *N.* 54. that in the Ordination of a Biſhop there is no ſuch thing as the extenſion of the Prieſtly Power and Character, but that a new power is conferr'd. And although he ſays this is done the Sacerdotal character ſtill remaining yet ſince he allows Epiſcopal Ordination to be a * Sacrament he muſt allow it alſo to imprint a new character as well as give a new power or elſe contradict the general Doctrine of his Church, which univerſally holds that the Sacrament of Orders always imprints a Character, and beſides to ſay that Epiſcopal Ordination gives a new power and not a new Character is a thing inconceivable; the new Character being nothing elſe according to their own definitions, but a new power; but however it ſufficiently obviates all that you ſay, that he plainly declares his opinion to be that there is no ſuch thing as the extenſion of the former Character and Power in Epiſcopal Ordination, but that a new power is conferr'd thereby; and therefore it is moſt evident that you ſay not this in the perſon of *Vaſquez*, but as a Doctrine which you have picked up from our Adverſaries, among whom it is generally aſſerted that the Epiſcopal Office doth not conſtitute a new order, or confer a new power different from the Sacerdotal, but is only the Sacerdotal farther extended as you expreſs it; but this is a Doctrine which I could eaſily ſhow you involves ſo many abſurdities as to be no better than down-right nonſenſe; as *Bellarmine* himſelf in a manner confeſſeth it to be, but ſince you ſay this is not your opinion there is no occaſion for it.

* 1 *Diſput.* 240. *cap.* 4.

De Sacramento ordinis cap. 5.

As to Biſhop *Ridleys* not being conſecrated by the *Roman* ordinal, although you have run into ſo many demonſtrable miſtakes about it already, and have been ſo often told that this is a thing on which the cauſe doth not at all depend, yet I perceive you will not forget it, but tell me that you are fully ſatisfied that it was ſo as you ſay; but if what you mention in your paper is all you have to urge for it, I perceive you are one that can very eaſily be ſatisfied in any thing which you think may make for the Cauſe of *Rome* againſt us. For to deal plainly with you, there is neither Truth, Senſe, nor Reaſon, in that which you write on this particular. You ſay that you find in the Statutes of the firſt of King *Edward* the 6th. that they (meaning I ſuppoſe the *Proteſtants*) took upon them to Adminiſter Sacraments in new ways after their own inventions, and that for this reaſon an Act was made that year prohibiting of them; and from hence you infer that new ways were alſo made uſe of in ordination; and conſequently that Biſhop *Ridley* was ordained by ſome ſuch new way, and not by the *Roman* ordinal; and this ſeems to be the laſt refuge you have to make out what you would have allowed you in this point. But in truth you having been miſ'd amongſt abundance of Abſurdities concerning it already, the more you ſtrive to get out, the deeper you get in. For,

1. Granting what you ſay to be true, that there was ſuch a Statute in the firſt year of King *Edward*, prohibiting the Adminiſtration of Sacraments, and among them that of orders, according to new ways; yet certainly after this Statute was made, and thoſe new ways prohibited as you ſay, none durſt ordain but by the old way of the *Roman* ordinal, till the other which was afterwards uſed, was Eſtabliſhed by Law in the fourth year of that Kings Reign; and therefore, if not *Ridley* who was conſecrated in the firſt year of King *Edward* before any Parliament ſate; yet certainly *Farrer*, who was made Biſhop in the ſecond year of his Reign after the time when you will have this prohibiting Statute to be made muſt be Conſecrated by the *Roman* ordinal only. And therefore if the Argument will not hold as to *Ridley*, yet certainly it muſt as to this other Holy Martyr; that it was not for any defect in the ordinal by which he was conſecrated that thoſe *Marian* Perſecutors that brought him to the ſtake would not allow him to be a Biſhop.

But 2. Having looked over all the Statutes of the firſt year of King *Edward* the ſixth I find no ſuch thing as you ſay in any of them. There is an Act indeed for a new way of Electing of Biſhops but nothing as to the manner of their Conſecration. And there is another Act alſo which complains of Abuſes in Matters of Religion, and particularly as to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper; but this refers only to irreverent and abuſive ſpeaking of thoſe Holy things, and not to any innovations and changes made concerning them.

3. In the third year of that Kings Reign, there was I muſt confeſs an Act paſſed of the nature of what you ſay, whereby the reformed Liturgy was

firſt

firſt authoriſed in the Preamble of which mention is made of divers forms of prayers and different Rites and Ceremonies uſed both in Cathedral and Pariſh Churches, not only in the daily Service but alſo in the Adminiſtration of Sacraments, and that ſome of them had been lately introduced, which are there called new Rites and Innovations. And if this be that which you refer to, as I ſuppoſe, there are theſe two things to be ſaid concerning it.

1. That thoſe various differences and diſagreements of Rites and Ceremonies then uſed in the Church, which this Act refer's to, were not all from the Proteſtants, but moſt of them from the Papiſts themſelves; who had different Forms of Prayers, and different Rites and manners of Worſhip of long time before in this Land, according to the different uſes of *Sarum*, *York*, *Bangor* and *Lincoln*, as the Act expreſſeth, there being no ſuch thing as a Uniformity of publick Worſhip in this Land till this Act; and therefore you are not to underſtand that all thoſe things were the innovations of *Proteſtants*, which are prohibited therein.

2. That it cannot be denied that Innovations cauſed by *Proteſtants* alſo, are mentioned in this Act, and that ſeveral zealous people in the Reign of King *Edward*, finding the Government to favour a Reformation, made too much haſt to lay aſide thoſe Superſtitions and Corruptions which offended them, and went before the publick Authority herein in Reforming the publick Worſhip, before any Law was made to give them Warrant ſo to do: And hence came as various manners of Worſhip among *Proteſtants*, as were among *Papiſts* before; for the prevention of both which, and bringing all things to an exact Uniformity, this Act was made. But that any of the Innovations mention'd in this Act, were in the manner of Ordaining; or that any Biſhop in giving of Orders, did ever vary from the old Ordinal uſed in King *Henry* the Eighths time, till the Act made in the 4th. year of King *Edwards* Reign did Authoriſe them ſo to do, I utterly deny: And that for theſe following Reaſons.

Firſt, This Act plainly refers thoſe Innovations to popular Zeal, but thoſe that had the power of Ordaining were only the Biſhops, the ſame perſons who had the chief hand in making this Act; and therefore there is no likelyhood that they ſhould be guilty of thoſe Innovations which are there ſo much complained of.

Secondly, The Preamble of all Acts ever bearing Reference to the ſubſequent Law Enacted by them; the former never uſeth to recite any other Abuſes, but what the later is made to be a Remedy againſt: And therefore there being no Remedy in this Act againſt any Innovations made in the manner of Ordaining (the Liturgy then Authoriſed not having the Ordinal in it) or any the leaſt mention therein that there was any ſuch thing, it is demonſtration that none ſuch could be meant or intended by the Preamble.

Thirdly, It is ſo far from being likely, that any Innovations ſhould be made in the manner of Ordaining till the Law authoriſed it, that if you pleaſe to ask your Brother, who is a Lawyer, he will tell you that it is impoſſible any ſuch thing could be done by reaſon of the ſevere penalties and forfeitures which both the Ordainer as well as the Ordained muſt neceſſarily incur thereby. For,

1. For any Biſhop to ordain by any other than the Legal Form, or at all to vary from it, which only the *Roman* Ordinal was for the three firſt years of King *Edward* the 6th's Reign, would bring him into a *Præmunire*, which is one of the ſevereſt penalties the Law inflicts, as containing a forfeiture, not only of Lands, Goods and Preferments, but alſo of Liberty and Protection too during Life. And whereas *Hooper*, appointed to be Biſhop of *Gloceſter* in that Kings Reign deſired only to be Conſecrated without the Epiſcopal Veſtments, and Oath of Canonical Obedience; and got the Earl of *Warwick*, then the greateſt man in the Kingdom, and who at that time govern'd all at his pleaſure, to intercede for him; yet the Arch-Biſhop would not conſent thereto, ‖ for his Anſwer was it would make him incur a Præmunire. And,

‖ Burnets *Hiſtory of the Reformation, Part.2. pag.154.*

2. As to the Perſons Ordained, ſhould they have received Orders by any other than Legal Forms, it would have drawn a Legal Invalidity upon the whole Adminiſtration, and left the perſons ſo ordained (although they might have had all the Eſſentials of Orders thereby) utterly incapable of any Eccleſiaſtical promotion whatever, a Legal Ordination being always a neceſſary requiſite to make any man capable of an Eccleſiaſtical Benefice: And therefore ſhould Biſhop *Ridley*, or Biſhop *Farrer* have been ordained by any new Form different from the *Roman*, which was then the only Legal Ordinal in this Land, they could not be Legally inveſted with their Biſhopricks, could acquire no right to their Temporalties, or to have a place in Parliament, or would any of their Acts or Leaſes have been good in Law; and we never heard that any of thoſe things were ever diſputed till the Cruelty of the *Marian* Perſecution came upon them.

Fourthly, *Sanders* himſelf, one of the moſt virulent Adverſaries of our Reformation, ſays the contrary; for treating of this Parliament, which authoriſed the new Ordinal in the Reign of King *Edward*, he ſays, it was then Enacted, *That whereas the Biſhops and Presbyters of* England, *were even unto that time Ordained in the ſame manner almoſt as with Catholicks*, (excepting the Oath of Obedience to the Pope, which all denied) *for the future Ordinations ſhould be performed by another altogether differing Form, preſcribed by themſelves.* Which is a plain Teſtimony from a Writer whoſe Authority, I ſuppoſe, none that are againſt us in this matter will deny, that till the Parliament Enacted

De Schiſmate Anglicano. lib.2. p. 205.

Enacted the making of a new Ordinal in the 4th. year of King *Edward* the 6th. Biſhops and Prieſts were ſtill ordained according to the *Roman* Ordinal in all things excepting the Oath of Obedience to the Pope, which no Biſhop took at his Ordination after the Supremacy of the Church was veſted in the Crown. And therefore *Ridley* and *Farrer* being made Biſhops before that Act, muſt neceſſarily be ordained by no other but the *Roman* Ordinal. And therefore although in the beginning of King *Edward*'s Reign, before the Liturgy was eſtabliſh'd, ſome zealous *Proteſtants* taking encouragement from the favour they receiv'd from the Government, might of their own heads in thoſe Churches as were in their power, make ſuch alterations in the publick Worſhip, and the Adminiſtration of the two Sacraments, of Baptiſme and the Lords Supper, and other holy Rites, as you call new ways of their own Invention, yet as to your Queſtion, Why might they not alſo as well Conſecrate and Ordain according to their own Inventions? I hope what I have ſaid is a full anſwer that there could be no ſuch thing. At beſt you propoſe it only as a Conjecture, which you inferr'd without any Reaſon or Argument in the leaſt to enforce it. And what I have ſaid, I hope may be ſufficient to aſſure you that there can be none for it. As to Mr. *Acton*'s Paper, to which you refer me, I know nothing of it, having never ſeen it, or any thing elſe which came from him to the Gentleman you mention, and therefore can give you no anſwer thereto.

In the laſt place you ſeem ſo taken with thoſe Conceptions of yours which you have vented in the paper you ſent me, that you would perſwade me not to attempt any further Anſwer, but that tamely yielding this Queſtion I ſhould proceed to another which you propoſe, concerning the conſiſtency of the validity of our Orders with the ſixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*. But I muſt beg your pardon for not obſerving the firſt part of your Command in tamely yielding the Cauſe to thoſe weak ſuggeſtions which you ſent me; I hope whatſoever your opinion might be of them before, I have by this time ſhown you, that there is nothing unanſwerable in them; and if I have tranſgreſſed in doing ſo, I will endeavour to make amends for it in giving you full ſatisfaction to what is the ſecond part of your Command in reference to the ſixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*. The Queſtion which you propoſe concerning it is this: Whether any Biſhop or Arch-biſhop can validly be made ſuch, without the Conſent of his Superior, or by faculty from him for his Conſecration? In order to the giving you full ſatisfaction as to this, I will firſt ſet down the words of the Canon it ſelf, and then endeavour to Anſwer your Queſtion concerning it.

And Firſt, The words of the ſixth Canon of the Council of *Nice* are as followeth. *Let ancient Cuſtoms ſtill take place, thoſe that are in* Egypt, Libya, *and* Pentapolis, *that the Biſhop of* Alexandria *have power over all theſe, becauſe ſuch alſo is the Cuſtom of the Biſhop of* Rome. *And accordingly in* Antioch,

Antioch, *and other Provinces, let the Priviledges be preſerved to the Churches. This alſo is altogether evident, that if any man be made a Biſhop without the conſent of the Metropolitan, this great Synod Decrees ſuch an one to be no Biſhop. And if two or three, out of a contentious humour, ſhall oppoſe the Common Election duely and regularly made according to the Canon of the Church, let the Majority of voices in this Caſe prevail.* Thus far the words of the Canon; and the Argument which you deduce from hence, is, I ſuppoſe, becauſe Archbiſhop *Parker* was conſecrated without the Popes Bulls, therefore his Conſecration muſt be void and null; and he being for this reaſon no Biſhop, conſequently could make none elſe ſo: And therefore all the Biſhops that have been ſince in the *Engliſh* Church, deriving their Orders from him, are in truth and reality no Biſhops, or inveſted with any power to ordain others; and conſequently that all Ordinations adminiſtred ſince in the Church of *England*, being through this defect null and void, we have no ſuch thing as true Orders among us. And thus far having urged your Argument for you with all the ſtrength that the thing can bear, in Anſwer thereto I ſhall lay down theſe following particulars.

1. That you could not have lighted on any Canon of the Church more unluckily for the Cauſe of *Rome*, which you are ſo zealous for, than this you have mention'd, it being that which directly overthrows the Supremacy of the Pope, and puts him upon the level with all other Metropolitans of the Chriſtian Church.

2. That allowing this Canon to have all the force you will give it, yet if Orders be an Inſtitution of Jeſus Chriſt, they cannot be annull'd by any breach thereof; for Eccleſiaſtical Canons are only the Ordinances of Men, and therefore cannot annul or invalidate that which hath a Divine appointment for the original of its Inſtitution; and therefore in this caſe the ſaying of *Becanus* the Jeſuit falls in very pat to anſwer your Objection: ‖ *Prohibitio Eccleſiæ ſolum facit ut Ordinatio ſit illicita non autem ut ſit irrita. The prohibition of the Church only makes that an Ordination may be illegal, not that it can be null.* For the power which is given by God, cannot be taken away by the prohibition of the Church. But ſince a Biſhop hath received power to ordain others according to Divine Inſtitution, although he lye under all the Canonical Impediments that poſſibly he can be liable unto to hinder him from the Execution of his Office, yet if he will notwithſtanding proceed therein to the conferring of Orders, the Character is as fully given by him, as he himſelf received it: And in this caſe the old Rule I have afore mention'd, muſt again take place, *quod fieri non debet factum valet*; although the thing ought not to be done, yet is valid when done: And therefore allowing what you ſay to be true that the Biſhops who ordained Arch-biſhop *Parker* without the Popes Bull, as well as he himſelf that was thus ordained by them were guilty of

‖ *De Sacramento ordinis. cap. 26. Quæſt. 2.*

the

the breach of this Canon, yet at the moſt it can only be an uncanonical, not an invalid Ordination.

3. Therefore as to the words of the Canon, [*this great Synod decrees ſuch an one to be no Biſhop*] can reſpect only his Benefice, not his Office and Character; that is, that ſuch an one as ſhould be thus Ordained a Biſhop of any place without the Conſent of his Metropolitan, ſhould not be allowed to be Biſhop of that place, ſo as there to execute the Office, or any where enjoy the Honour and Priviledges belonging thereto; not that his Ordination ſhould be looked on as invalid, as to the Character and Office of a Biſhop conferred on him thereby: Becauſe if that be given according to Chriſts Inſtitution, it cannot be taken away again by any Inſtitutions of men whatever, but according to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, the Character being indelebly imprinted on him, it is no more in the power of the Church to deprive him of that, than to deprive him of his Baptiſme.

4. You muſt not look on Eccleſiaſtical Canons in how ſolemn a manner ſoever made to be ſuch Sacred and immutable things as to put a neceſſary obligation upon the Church indiſpenſably to obſerve them through all times after. For they are no more than other humane Laws made to obviate the preſent Grievances, and regulate the diſorders of the Body for which they are made; and in the ſame manner alſo as the Circumſtances of Time, Place and Things alter, frequently grow into diſuſe and become obſolete thereby; and that this particularly was the caſe of that Canon of the Council of *Nice*, which you inſiſt on, will plainly appear; for it was never deſigned as a Law to reach the whole Church of Chriſt through all times and places of its Eſtabliſhment ſo as for ever to lay an obligation upon all that are Chriſtians to obſerve it. Neither was it ever in the power of any Council to make any ſuch, but as moſt other Canons ſo eſpecially this was made upon a particular occaſion, and that occaſion was this.

* During the *Maximian* Perſecution there was one *Meletius* Biſhop of *Lycopolis* in *Egypt*, who in the heat of that Perſecution having ſacrificed to Idols to ſave his Life was for this reaſon, by *Peter* Biſhop of *Alexandria* his Metropolitan, in a Synod of the Biſhops of the Province, depoſed from his Biſhoprick; but he not acquieſceing in this Sentence became the Head of a Sect, and in a Schiſmatical way in oppoſition to the Metropolitan, not only retained his Biſhoprick which he was depoſed from, but alſo took upon him to act as Metropolitan himſelf, and ordained Biſhops throughout all *Egypt*, which by ancient Cuſtom was the Right of the Biſhop of *Alexandria* only in that Province, of which *Alexander* one of the Succeſſors of *Peter* in the See of *Alexandria* complaining at the Council of *Nice*, the 4th. and 6th. Canons of that Council were framed on purpoſe for the redreſs hereof, and the prevention of all other ſuch like diſorders for the future; thereby it was decreed, that all Biſhops for the future ſhould

* *Socratis lib. 1. cap. 3. Theodaret. lib. 1. cap. 9. Hiſt.*

ſhould be ordained in the provincial Synods, where all the Biſhops of the Province mett together; but if this could not be ſo conveniently done it might be performed by any three of them with the Conſent of the reſt ſignified by letters and the allowance and confirmation of the Metropolitan; but that if any one ſhould be ordained without the Conſent of the Metropolitan, he ſhould not be allowed to be a Biſhop. And that as this was practiced in *Rome* ſo ſhould it be alſo in *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and other Provinces according to the ancient Cuſtom already receiv'd concerning that matter. And ſo the *Nicene* Fathers themſelves give an account thereof in their Synodical Epiſtle to the Church of *Alexandria*, written concerning it. But as this was ordained upon that particular occaſion, ſo alſo was it with reſpect to the then preſent ſtate and circumſtances of the Church, which at that time ſtood totally independent of it ſelf alone, and was altogether govern'd by its own Rules without the interpoſition of Princes, (*Conſtantine* the firſt Chriſtian Emperor being but newly Converted to the Faith). But afterwards when whole States became Chriſtian, and Biſhops were made temporal Barons of Kingdoms, and had vaſt Priviledges and Revenues given them by the Secular Power, the Elections were for the moſt part made according to the Commands of the Prince; and inſtead of that Judicial Approbation which is in this Canon given the Metropolitan, nothing afterwards was left him but the Vaſſallage of neceſſarily obeying the Mandate of the Prince, in Conſecrating whomſoever he ſhould appoint to the Benefice. For when Biſhops became thus great in the State as well as in the Church, Princes might well think themſelves concerned who the perſons ſhould be that ſhould be advanced to thoſe Dignities, and therefore ſeldom ſuffered any to be inveſted in them but ſuch as they had firſt approv'd; and this they had a great Right to do, as being for the moſt part the Founders and Patrons of the Benefices. Although afterwards the Quarrel about inveſtitures between the Weſtern Princes and the Church of *Rome*, made ſome alterations in this matter, yet the Metropolitan was not at all helped thereby, as to the right of Confirmation given him by this Canon at *Nice*, but what was taken from Princes was ſwallowed by the *Pope*, who by this Canon can claim no Right at all to interpoſe in this matter but is utterly excluded from it except in his own Province only. For from thenceforth his Bulls were always thought requiſite to all Conſecrations and Confirmations of Biſhops, which put an abſolute force upon the Metropolitan, or whom elſe he ſhould command in this matter, which cannot be reſiſted. However Princes found another way to ſalve themſelves after thoſe Inveſtitures were wreſted from them, that is, by not allowing any Election to be made without their Licenſe, and by ſending whenſoever they thought fit, with the Licenſe, a Mandate to the Electors to chuſe the perſon they nominated which is at preſent the General practice of all *Popiſh* States: So that inſtead of the Election of the people, and the Confirmation

firmation of the Metropolitan which by the *Nicene* Canons, and ancient practice of the Church were the only ways of making Biſhops, now *Princes* have the Elections, and the *Pope* the Confirmations, and the Metropolitan is utterly excluded from all that which by virtue of this Canon was his ancient Right herein. And having thus laid matters before you, I hope Sir, by this time you may ſee how little reaſon you have to infer any thing againſt us as to the Legality of our Ordinations from the Canon you have mention'd; it being that which hath ſo long ſince grown obſolete, and totally out of uſe even amongſt *Papiſts* themſelves. And if any of thoſe Gentlemen whom you converſe ſo much with, and whoſe Learning and Merits you ſo highly applaud, ſhall tell you that it is otherwiſe; and that all thoſe ancient Canons muſt be ſtill in their primitive force, and every thing be called uncanonical and illegal which is not agreeable to them: I deſire you would ask them theſe following Queſtions.

Firſt, That whereas the 4th. Canon of the Council of *Nice* Decrees that there ſhall be three Biſhops at leaſt at the Ordination of a Biſhop, whence comes it to paſs that now a days in the Church of *Rome*, it is allowed (as (*a*) *Bellarmine* and (*b*) *Binius* confeſs) to be performed by one only?

a *De Excl. milit. lib.* 4. *c.* 8.
b *Tom.* 1. *p.* 14.

Secondly, That whereas the 9th. Canon of the ſaid Council of *Nice* Decrees, that none ſhall be made *Presbyter* without being examin'd and found worthy: And the 10th. that thoſe that are raſhly admitted ſhall be again degraded: And the 11th. Canon of the Council of *Neo Cæſarea*, which was ancienter than that of *Nice*, that none ſhall be ordained a *Presbyter* till the age of Thirty, How comes it to paſs that ſo many in the Church of *Rome* are made not only *Presbyters*, but alſo *Biſhops* and *Cardinals*, not only before Thirty, but alſo before they have been of an age capable of any of thoſe Qualifications, which Examination is appointed to enquire about: For (*c*) *Ferdinando de Medices* was made Cardinal by *Sextus quintus* before he was thirteen years old; and *John de Medices* before him (who was afterwards *Pope*, by the name of *Leo* the 10th.) was made Biſhop at the 8th. and Cardinal at the 13th. year of his age; and *Coſmus* Biſhop of *Fano*, who died by an act of *Sodomy* committed upon him by one of the Baſtards of *Paul* the third, the *Pope* who call'd the Council of *Trent*, was not then above eighteen years old; and *Odell Chatillion*, and *Alphonſo* of *Portugal* were both Biſhops and Cardinals; the former at the 11th. and the later at the 7th. year of his age.

c *See* Raynold's *Apology for his Teſtes*, p. 292.

And ‖ *Glaber. Rodolphus* tells us alſo, that *Benedict* the 9th. was but twelve years old when he was created *Pope*; and he could not be well miſtaken herein, ſince he lived in his time.

‖ *Hiſt. lib.* 5. *c. ult*

Thirdly, You may ask them further, That whereas the 18th. Canon of the Council of *Nice* doth Ordain, that no Deacon ſhall ſit among the *Preſ-*

byters, but that a *Presbyter* ſhall be always above a *Deacon*, and a *Biſhop* above a *Presbyters*, how comes it now to be lawful for *Deacons*, when made *Cardinals*, to take place not only of *Presbyters*, but alſo of *Biſhops*, *Archbiſhops* and *Patriarchs* too? whereas they being no more than the *Pope's Deacons*, can according to the ancient Orders of the Church, claim no higher place thereby than the *Deacons* of any other Biſhop.

And Fourthly, I deſire it may be alſo asked them, that ſince the 6th. Canon of the Council of *Calcedon* ſo ſeverely prohibits all abſolute Ordinations (that is, ſuch as are made without a Title) as utterly to exclude all from the Office to which they are ſo Ordain'd; How comes it to paſs that it is ſo Common a practice of the Church of *Rome*, to ordain Biſhops without Biſhopricks? ſuch as the Biſhop of *Calcedon*, the Biſhop of *Adramytium*, and the Biſhop of *Amaſia*, and abundance of thoſe *nulla tenentes* men. And if the Titles they bear be urged to excuſe them from the breach of this Canon, it is a mockage which will not ſerve their turn. For the Title is only an empty name which they aſſume without any intent of ever being in reality Biſhops of thoſe places from whence they take them, or of at all executing any paſtoral charge in them. And if it were otherwiſe without this mockage in the thing, yet ſince this very 6th. Canon of the Council of *Nice* which you inſiſt on, ſaith that all Biſhops are to be ordained by their own Metropolitan, what hath the *Pope* to do to Ordain Biſhops for thoſe places, where he hath no Juriſdiction at all either as Metropolitan or Patriarch, as it is certain he hath not in any of thoſe Biſhopricks from whence thoſe Titles are uſually aſſum'd. For they take them almoſt always from the Biſhopricks of the Eaſtern Empire, which never acknowledged the Juriſdiction of the Biſhop of *Rome*, but had always Patriarchs of their own at *Conſtantinople*, *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, whoſe Juriſdiction continues even to this day. And under them thoſe very Biſhopricks being always provided of Biſhops of their own Legally Ordained, and Legally Inveſted with them, I ask further how comes it to paſs that contrary to the 8th. Canon of the Council of *Nice*, the Pope makes Biſhops of thoſe places where there are Biſhops already. And therefore if the Breach of ancient Canons, muſt void Ordinations, certainly theſe can be no Biſhops.

To go over all the reſt of the Ancient Canons of the Church, and ſhew how in the moſt wholſom things they ordained, the Church of *Rome* hath now totally deviated from them, would be too long a Task; what I have already ſaid is ſufficient to let you ſee that they have no regard to them themſelves; and therefore nothing can be more unreaſonable then to exact the obſervance of them from others, eſpecially in ſuch things as the alteration of Circumſtances, and the neceſſity of the times have made unpracticable, as it is plain what you require from us in the point of Ordaining at our Reformation then totally was. For,

Fifthly,

Fifthly, To have the *Popes* conſent to the Ordination of thoſe *Biſhops* that were made at the Reformation was a thing impoſſible to be had and in that caſe all Laws as well Eccleſiaſticall as civil neceſſarily loſe their force. For the Lawes of the Land had made it Treaſon to ask it of him, and if they had not, to be ſure the *Pope* would never grant it to thoſe who would not conform, with him to all the Erroneous Doctrins, and corrupt practices of his Church. Muſt we therefore have no *Biſhops*, and no Miniſters becauſe he would not give his conſent we ſhould? or muſt we ſtill have retained all thoſe corruptions and errours which he would impoſe upon us to obtain it, If the latter be ſaid (and I ſuppoſe this is what our adverſary would have,) it would put a neceſſity upon us to receive even the *Alcoran* or the *Talmud*, with all the impieties and abſurdities of them for neceſſary Doctrines of Faith and manners whenſoever the *Pope* ſhould pleaſe, and we durſt not truſt his Infallibility to ſecure us from this, ſince we know the time when a *Pope* ‖ of *Rome* was in Conſpiracy with the *Mendicant Fryers* to have impoſed a new Goſpel on the World in oppoſition to the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt, which if received would have made us worſe than *Turks* or *Jews*. Now put the caſe the plot had taken, and this Goſpel by his Authority had been received in the ſame manner as Tranſubſtantiation, the Sacrifice of the Maſs, half Communion, Purgatory, praying to Saints, Image Worſhip, and other like Impoſtures of that Church now are by the ſame Authority only for Infallible Truth, muſt we have received it too to gain his conſent to our Ordinations, or elſe muſt we have had no Orders at all becauſe he would not give it unto us unleſs we renounce our Chriſtianity to obtain it from him? I thank God our Condition is not ſuch, for the Laws of Chriſt give every Biſhop equal Authority to Ordain, and although ſome reſtrictions and limitations as to the Exerciſe of this power may have been put by the Laws of the Church, for the better Order and more regular Government of it; yet all thoſe Laws according to the Doctrine of the ‖ *Romaniſts* themſelves muſt alwayes give place whenever the neceſſity of times or things require it. And therefore though the Conſent of the *Pope* to our Ordinations had been required by the firmeſt Laws which the whole Univerſal Church could have eſtabliſhed, yet when ſuch a neceſſity is put upon us as that we cannot have his Conſent without ſubmitting to thoſe Errors and Corruptions as would make all our Orders an abomination in the preſence of him for whoſe Service they were Ordained (as was the Caſe of our firſt Reformers) it would become abſolutely neceſſary to Ordain without it.

‖ *See* Dr. Stillingfleet *of the Idolatries of the Church of* Rome.

‖ Andradius *de Gen. Concil. autoritate lib.* 1. *Defenſ. Fid. Trident* p 115, 116. Binnius *Tom.* 2. pag. 243.

But Sixthly, Allowing the *Nicene* Canon you inſiſt on, ſtill to retain the utmoſt force you can give it, yet there is nothing in it which requires what you would have in reference to us. For all that is there ſaid is, that in all

Provinces the Biſhops ſhould be Ordained by the conſent of the Metropolitan, which was very well provided for the preſervance of peace and good Order in the Church. But the Biſhop of *Rome* is not our Metropolitan, and in truth in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, the time to which your Objection refers, we had no Metropolitan at all in this Province; Cardinal *Pool* the laſt Metropolitan being then newly dead, and the Metropolitical See of *Canterbury* vacant thereby; and into his place it was that Archbiſhop *Parker* was Ordained: But here you will ſay, that as the provincial Biſhops were to be Ordained by the Metropolitan, ſo the Metropolitans were to be Ordained by the Patriarch; and the Biſhop of *Rome* being our Patriarch, for this Reaſon Arch-biſhop *Parker* ought not to have been Ordain'd without his Conſent, and that his Ordination was illegal for want thereof. But to this I ſay,

1. That this is not at all ſaid in the Canon you inſiſt on, that extending no farther than to Metropolitans in reſpect of their Com-provincials, as it is alſo plainly expreſſed in the Fourth Canon of that Council. For in truth Patriarchs were not then in being neither could be, that Diviſion of the Empire into Dioceſſes conſiſting each of many Provinces, which gave occaſion for the firſt conſtituting of Patriarchs, being but juſt then made; and therefore it muſt be ſome time after before there could be any Birth given to that Inſtitution, and in the Council of *Chalcedon*, which was held 126 years after that of *Nice* is the firſt time we find any mention of it, no ancient Records of the Church before that time in the leaſt giving us any account thereof.

2. Suppoſing Patriarchs ſhould have been then meant, yet *Brittain* was never of the Patriarchate of the Biſhop of *Rome*; which is ſufficiently made out not only by our Learned Dean of *Pauls* in his *Origines Brittanicæ cap.* 3. but alſo by ſeveral of the *Roman* Communion alſo, and eſpecially by Father *Barns* a *Benedictine* Monk, who wrote a Book particularly to that purpoſe.

3. I deny that it was the ancient practice of the Church for *Metropolitans* to be Ordained by the approbation of the Patriarch, or that his conſent was at all thought requiſite hereto. For the Cuſtom was when a new Metropolitan was choſen, that he ſhould be Ordained by his own Comprovincials. And ſo was Arch-biſhop *Parker*, he having been Conſecrated by four Biſhops of his own Province; and that this was a practice not only introduced by ancient uſage, but alſo eſtabliſh'd by many Decrees and Canons of the Church, not only ‖ *Petrus de Marca* Arch-biſhop of *Paris*, but alſo * *Hallier*, another eminent Doctor of the *French* Church, do give us a large Account: And it is but of late date, that the Biſhops of *Rome* interpoſed herein, as is told you in a Pamphlet juſt now come from *France* concerning the proceedings of the Parliament of *Paris* upon the Popes Bull, for therein the Kings Advocate tells that Parliament, that for the four firſt Ages of

‖ *Tom. 2. lib. 6. c.* 4.

* *De Sacris Electionibus & ordinationibus.* Part. 3. Sect. 5. c. 4. Art. 2.

of that Monarchy, there was no ſuch thing as ſuing to *Rome* for Benefices: And *Petrus* (c) *de Marca* tells you the ſame thing. And having ſaid thus much, I know not any thing which can be further urged for the ſupport of your laſt Objection, requiring the Popes conſent to our Ordinations, unleſs you fly to that Paramount Supremacy challenged to him by ſo many, which makes him the only Supream Paſtor of the Church, under Chriſt, and all other Biſhops as his Delegates, which act only by his Au hority, and have no other but what is derived from him: And if you ſay this, all the Anſwer I ſhall give you thereto is, that this is a pretenſion ſo extravagant, and ſo totally void of all manner of ground for its ſupport, that not only the Proteſtants, but alſo the better part of his own Communion utterly deny it unto him.

(c) *Tom. 2. lib. 5 cap. 4.*

And now having gone through your Paper, all that remains for me further to do in order to your full ſatisfaction is, that I perform my promiſe in making good unto you, that ſuppoſing an Imperative Form of words in Ordination to be ſo eſſentially neceſſary as you would have it, yet the Forms made uſe of in our Ordinal for the Ordination of a Prieſt were before the additions made to them by the Convocation in the year 1662, altogether ſufficient in order thereto. For as there is Matter and Form (as they call them) in all Ordinations adminiſtred by the Church of *Rome*, ſo alſo is there in ours, that is, an outward viſible ſign at the performance of the adminiſtration, and a Form of words expreſſing the thing intended thereby; the former of which they call the Matter, and the latter the Form of Ordination. And as there is a double Matter and Form in their Ordinal for the Ordaining of a Prieſt, ſo is there alſo in ours; and that all things may appear the more clearly to you, what I have hereafter to ſay concerning them in order to the ſatisfying you in the point propoſed. *Firſt*, I ſhall lay them down both together, that is, the Matters and Forms of their Ordinal as well as the Matters and Forms of our Ordinal, as they were before the additions made to the Forms that are afore-mentioned; that having that in your view which is the ſubject of the whole Diſpute, you may the better underſtand what ſhall be urg'd concerning it. *Secondly*, I ſhall from both of them obſerve ſome few particulars unto yet pleading to the ſame end. And then *Thirdly*, Having ſtated your Objection as fairly, and to the beſt advantage of your Cauſe that I can, I ſhall in the laſt place proceed to Anſwer it with ſuch Arguments, as I hope will give you full ſatisfaction.

Firſt, As to the Matter and Forms for the Ordination of a Prieſt both of the *Romiſh* Ordinal as well as thoſe of ours, as they were before the additions made to the Forms in the year 1662. They are as followeth;

In

In the Romiſh *Ordinal.*

The firſt Matter is the delivery of the Chalice with Wine and Water in it, and the Paten on the top of it, with the Hoſt thereon: To the perſon to be Ordained to the Prieſthood;

The firſt Form is theſe words, ſpoken by the Biſhop at the delivery of the ſaid Chalice and Paten; *Receive Power to offer Sacrifice unto God, and to Celebrate Maſſes both for the Living and the Dead, in the name of the Lord. Amen.*

The ſecond Matter is the Impoſition of both the Hands of the Biſhop that Ordains, on the Head of the perſon Ordained.

The ſecond Form is the words ſpoken by the Biſhop at the time of the ſaid Impoſition of his Hands; *Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins thou doſt remit they are remitted unto them, and whoſe ſins thou doſt retain they are retained.*

In the Ordinal of the Church of England.

The firſt Matter is the Impoſition of the Hands of the Biſhop and Presbytery, aſſiſting with him at the Ordination on the Head of the Perſon Ordained.

The firſt Form is theſe words, ſpoken by the Biſhop at the time of the ſaid Impoſition of Hands; *Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins thou doſt forgive they are forgiven, and whoſe ſins thou doſt retain they are retained, and be thou a faithful diſpenſer of the Word of God, and of His Holy Sacraments, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt. Amen.*

The ſecond Matter is the delivery of the Bible by the Biſhop to the perſon Ordained.

The ſecond Form is theſe words, ſpoken by the Biſhop at the ſaid delivery of the Bible; *Take thou Authority to Preach the Word of God, and to miniſter the Holy Sacraments in this Congregation where thou ſhalt be ſo appointed.*

And thus having laid before you the Matters and Forms (as they call them) made uſe of in both Ordinals. *Secondly*, The particulars which I think requiſite to obſerve unto you from both of them in order to the better clearing unto you the point propoſed, are

1. That as to the Matters and Forms of the *Roman* Ordinal, although the opinions of their Writers and Doctors are very various about them, yet that which is now moſt generally received among them is, that both theſe Matters and Forms are eſſential to the conferring of the Office, and that the firſt Matter and Form gives Power over the Natural Body of Chriſt; that is, to Conſecrate the Euchariſt, wherein they will have Chriſts Natural Body by vertue of their inconceivable Tranſubſtantiation to be really preſent,

ſent, and the other Matter and Form give Power over His Myſtical Body; that is, the people of His Church to abſolve them from their ſins. The firſt they call the Power of Order, and the ſecond the Power of Juriſdiction; and in theſe two they ſay the whole Office and Authority of the Chriſtian Prieſthood is conferred.

2. That as to theſe very particular Matters and Forms in their preſent Ordinal, although the Schoolmen were generally for having them of Divine Inſtitution, and not to be varied from (as is above noted); yet the generality of Learned Men among them at preſent are of another opinion, as holding it only of Divine Inſtitution that there ſhould be Matter and Form in general in all Ordinations; but what the particular Matter and Form ſhould be was left to the Church to determine, and conſequently that nothing elſe is neceſſary, but that the Matters bear with them ſome fitneſs to ſignifie and denote the thing intended, and that the Forms be fully expreſſive of the Power and Office conferred thereby: And this as to the Forms ſeems to be the opinion which you allow: For you do not abſolutely require that we ſhould uſe the *Roman* Forms, as if no Orders could be validly conferred without them; but only that we ſhould either uſe them, or ſuch as are equivalent with them, wherein the whole Prieſtly Power may be expreſly given to the perſon Ordain'd, and your opinion that by ours this is not done, ſeems to be the whole reaſon of your Objection.

3. As to thoſe Signs and Forms of words annexed to them, made uſe of in our Ordinal, which in conformity to the Language of the *Romaniſts*, we alſo call Matter and Form; we do not think either of them ſo eſſential to the adminiſtration as to null ſuch Orders as may be conferred without them, provided it be done ſome other way ſufficiently declarative of the thing intended: For we look on nothing to be of Divine Inſtitution in Orders but the Miſſion it ſelf; that is, *that the Chief Paſtors of our Church ſend others as they are ſent*; and when this is done by a perſon fully Authorized thereto, we look on all to be perform'd in this particular which the Præſcripts of our Saviour direct us to. As to the manner of the Miſſion, and the method of Ordaining thereto, we think this intruſted with them to whom the Authority of granting the Miſſion is given, to order and appoint it, as they may think will beſt expreſs the thing they do. However we do by no means approve the receding from the ancient and long received practice of the Church herein, but think that thoſe uſages which can be traced up to the primitive and purer times of the Church, eſpecially if they reach ſo high as the Apoſtolical Age, when the Holy Spirit of God was given in an extraordinary manner to be a conduct in all things of this nature, do from the practice of thoſe Holy and Inſpir'd Men which then uſed them, receive ſuch plain evidence of their conformity to the will of God, that they cannot, unleſs in ſome extraordinary caſe, without the greateſt raſhneſs be varied from,

from, as I have before ſaid. And this our firſt Reformers having a full ſenſe of did not in the compiling of the Ordinal, which you find ſo much fault with, indulge their own fancies; but as true Reformers, laying Scripture and Primitive Practice before them for the Rule of what they did, made it their endeavour to reduce all things thereto, and therefore finding from Scripture and the practice of the Church from the beginning, that Prayers and Impoſition of Hands was the ancient manner of Ordaining, they carefully retain'd both theſe in our Ordinal, Prayers very fitly compoſed to recommend the perſon unto God for the Office to which he is appointed, and Impoſition of Hands to execute the Authority received from God to confer it on him. And although there be no inſtance of any Imperative Form of words to be at all made uſe of in any of the ancient Ordinals for near a Thouſand Years after Chriſt, (as is above noted) yet ſince the later Ages have introduced them, and they appear to be of great uſe, the better and more clearly to expreſs and declare the intent and meaning of the outward Rite to which they are annexed, we have thoſe alſo in our Ordinals, and in the choice of them, making Scripture our Rule, we do for the Ordination of a Prieſt uſe the very ſame Form of words which our Saviour himſelf made uſe of when He Ordained His Holy Apoſtles to the ſame Office; *Joh.* 20. 22, 23. *Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins thou doſt forgive they are forgiven, and whoſe ſins thou doſt retain they are retained*, adding alſo thereto theſe words, both as explanatory of them, and exhortatory to the duties of the Office conferr'd, *and be thou a faithful diſpenſer of the word of God, and of his Holy Sacraments*; and then to expreſs the Authority by which this is done, is ſubjoyned, *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt. Amen.* The want of which in the *Roman* Ordinals is a defect they cannot be excuſed from. And this outward Rite or Sign of Impoſition of Hands, and this Form of words annex'd thereto was the whole manner appointed by our firſt Reformers for the conferring of the Office of Prieſthood on thoſe that were Ordained to it, and ſo it continued till in the firſt Convocation after the late King's Reſtauration, *Anno* 1662. after *Receive the Holy Ghoſt*, theſe additional words, *for the office and work of a Prieſt in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the Impoſition of our Hands*, were for the reaſons which I have aforementioned unto you, alſo inſerted in that Form.

4. Therefore you are to underſtand that the ſecond Matter and Form of our Ordinal abovementioned were not at all intended to conferr the Order or any part thereof, but only to (*a*) aſſign the place for the execution of the Office already received. For by the firſt Matter and Form Impoſition of Hands, and the Form of words annexed, the perſon Ordained thereby is fully and wholly made a Prieſt or Presbyter of the Church of Chriſt; and all that is done by the

(*a*) Maſon *lib.* 5. *cap.* 1.

the ſecond Matter and Form, is to admit him thus Ordain'd, to be a Prieſt or Presbyter of that Congregation; that is of that Dioceſs, (the whole Dioceſs being as one Congregation or Pariſh, in reſpect of the Biſhop Ordaining) to execute the Duties of his Office, expreſs'd by *Preaching of the Word, and Adminiſtering the Holy Sacraments*, in the place *where he ſhall be appointed thereto*, and this was ſo order'd conform to the Ancient Canons of the Church, which very ſeverely forbid (*b*) all abſolute Ordinations; that is, all ſuch Ordinations whereby Orders are given at large, without intitling the Perſon Ordained to any particular Church for the executing the Duties of the Office received. For it was the Ancient Cuſtom, that every Biſhop ſhould Ordain his own Presbyters and none other; and that when he Ordained them he ſhould admit them to be Presbyters of his Church, either to officiate in the Mother Church it ſelf where the Biſhop had his Chair, or elſe in ſome of the other inferiour Churches of the Dioceſs, which all belonged thereto; and whether they did the one or the other, they were all reckoned as Presbyters of that one Church, the Dioceſs anciently being looked on as one Pariſh, and all the Chriſtians of it as one Congregation united together under their Biſhop, and conformable hereto is it that the Biſhop ſaith in the Ordinal above-mention'd. *Take thou Authority to Preach the Word of God, and to miniſter the Holy Sacraments in the Congregation where thou ſhalt be ſo appointed*; *i.e.* Take thou Authority to execute the Office of a Prieſt in this Dioceſs in that particular Church or Pariſh thereof where thou ſhalt be appointed ſo to do. But ſince the Ancient Canons (*c*) which forbad Presbyters ever to forſake that Church or Dioceſs whereof they were firſt admitted Presbyters, to go into another Dioceſs, is now through the whole Chriſtian World grown quite obſolete, and would be of much more prejudice than benefit now to be obſerv'd. At the aforeſaid review of our Ordinal in the Year 1662. this Form alſo hath received an Alteration, and what was afore *in this Congregation where thou ſhalt be ſo appointed*, is now *in the Congregation where thou ſhalt be lawfully appointed thereto*; and thereby that Faculty or Licenſe to *Preach the Word and Adminiſter the Sacraments* which was afore given as to the Dioceſs only where the Perſon was Ordained, is now made General as to the whole National Church in any part thereof, whereof the Perſon thus Ordain'd to the Prieſthood ſhall be lawfully called to execute the Duties thereof.

(*b*) *Concil. Chalced. can 6. Concil. Milden. can. 52. Concil. Valent. can. 6.*

(*c*) *Concil. Nicen. can. 15, 16.*

And having premiſed theſe things unto you concerning the Matters and Forms made uſe of in the Ordinals of both Churches, for your clearer underſtanding of what is on either ſide intended by them; I now come to your Objection, which according to the beſt advantage that it can be ſtated I apprehend to be thus. You looking on a Form of Words fully expreſſing the

whole Prieſtly power to be indiſpenſably neceſſary and abſolutely eſſential to all Ordinations of Prieſts, think our Orders of Prieſthood invalidly adminiſtred as failing in an eſſential, becauſe we have no ſuch Form expreſſing the whole Prieſtly power at our Ordinations of Prieſts. For the Form which we uſe, you ſay, is not ſuch, as by no means expreſſing the whole Prieſtly power, becauſe it makes no mention of Conſecrating the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, and making preſent the Body and Blood of our Saviour (as you term it) which you look on as the chiefeſt and main power of the Prieſtly Office, but only impowers to forgive Sins. And although you allow our Form at preſent, ſince the inſertion of thoſe words, [*for the Office and Work of a Prieſt in the Church of God*] to be ſufficiently perfect, becauſe in the word *Prieſt* you think may be included all that belongs to him, yet ſtill judge our Orders to be invalid by reaſon of the former defect; becauſe, ſay you, if the *Presbyters* of the Church of *England* were not validly Ordain'd by the firſt Form till the addition above-mentioned was inſerted in the Year 1662, then through this defect, thoſe who were choſen out of them to be *Biſhops* could not validly be ordained ſuch, becauſe they were not afore *Presbyters* or *Prieſts*, none being capable in your opinion to be *Biſhops*, who have not been firſt made *Prieſts*, and conſequently could not have Authority to Ordain others by any Form of Words how perfect ſoever afterwards deviſed. And this being your Objection urged in its utmoſt ſtrength for the Cauſe you argue for, I am now to tell you in Anſwer thereto, that the whole of it goes upon three very great Miſtakes.

The Firſt is, That any ſuch a Form of Words is Eſſential to Orders.

Secondly, That the Order of Prieſthood is abſolutely neceſſary to qualify a man for the Order of Epiſcopacy. And,

Thirdly, That our Form of Prieſtly Ordination doth not include the whole Prieſtly power.

As to the Firſt, Although we allow ſuch Formes very uſeful to make a more clear declaration of the intent and meaning of that act whereby the Office is conferr'd, and therefore do our ſelves retain them in our Church, yet that any ſuch ſhould be eſſential to the Adminiſtration, ſo as to null and make void the Orders that are conferr'd without them, is that which wants all manner of Evidence either from Scripture, Ancient Practice, the nature of the thing it ſelf, or any other reaſon whatever, which I have already made ſufficiently clear unto you. And therefore without repeating what I have before ſaid, I ſhall paſs on to the other two particulars in which you are equally miſtaken.

For Secondly, That the Order of Prieſthood is abſolutely neceſſary to quallify a man for the Order of Epiſcopacy, ſo that none can be made a Biſhop unleſs he were firſt a Prieſt, is that you can have no ground for. The Holy Scriptures from whence alone the eſſential requiſites of Chriſt's Inſtitutions

tions are to be ſought for, ſay no ſuch thing; but for any thing which appeares there to the contrary, *Titus* and *Timothy* were at their firſt Ordination made Biſhops, without ever being admitted into the Inferiour Orders at all, but receiv'd all the power of them included in that of Epiſcopacy. And in all probability many ſuch Ordinations were at firſt made. For in the Beginning things could not be ſo ſettled in the Church that the Regular method of calling men always from the inferiour Offices to the higher ſhould then be obſerv'd, but without all doubt in that ſtate of the firſt planting of the Goſpel, either as the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt then given to ſome men, recommended them, or the neceſſities of the Church required, there were frequent reaſons of conferring the Epiſcopal Office at firſt, where no other had been received in order thereto. And if you will have any regard to the opinion of *Petavius*, one of the Learnedeſt Men which the Society of the Jeſuites ever had, he tells us that in the firſt times of the Church there were none or very few ſimple *Presbyters* at all; but that all or the moſt part of thoſe that then Officiated in Churches were Ordained Biſhops: His words are, * *Primis illis Eccleſiæ temporibus exiſtimo Presbyteros vel omnes vel eorum pleroſque ſic ordinatos eſſe ut Epiſcopi pariter ac Presbyteri gradum obtinerent*; i. e. *In thoſe firſt times of the Church, I am of opinion that Presbyters either all or the moſt part of them were ſo Ordain'd that they obtain'd both the degree of a Biſhop and Presbyter together.* But whatſoever was done at firſt, afterward I allow when Churches increaſed, and in each of them there was the ſubordination of many Presbyters and Deacons aſſiſting under the Biſhop for the performance of the Divine Offices, and the Diſcipline and outward Policy of the Church was brought to a ſettled order; Then that which is the uſual practice of moſt other bodies, became alſo to be the Rule of Chriſtians in conſtituting the Miniſters and Officers of the Church, that is, to advance them by degrees from one Order to another, and not to place men in the higheſt Order till they had approv'd themſelves worthy by the well diſcharge of their Duty in thoſe inferiour thereto; and accordingly thenceforth on Vacancies, Biſhops were made out of the Presbyters, and the Presbyters out of the Deacons; and although this method might be introduced even in the times of the Apoſtles themſelves, yet it was not by any Divine Inſtitution, ſo as to make it abſolutely neceſſary a man be a Deacon before he can be a Presbyter, or a Presbyter before he can be a Biſhop, but only by Eccleſiaſtical appointment for the well regulating the Order of the Church and the better providing for the benefit of it, thoſe in all reaſon being preſumed to be the moſt fitting for the Superiour Orders that had been prepared for them by long exerciſing themſelves in, and faithfully diſcharging the duties of the Inferiour. But however this Rule was not always obſerved, but often when the benefit of the Church required, and the extraordinary qualifications of men recommended

* *Diſſertationum Eccleſiaſticarum lib. 1. cap. 2.*

them, Biſhops were made not only out of Deacons, but alſo out of Laymen too; and that by one Ordination, the giving of the Superiour Order being alwayes then underſtood to include therein all the power of the inferiour. Thus ſeveral of the firſt Ages of the Church were made Biſhops from Laymen, and thoſe Hiſtories which tell us of it acquaint us but with one Ordination whereby they were advanced thereto. And *Pontius* the Writer of the Life of St. *Cyprian*, tells us of him, that he was made a Presbyter without ever being a Deacon, and ſo was alſo *Paulinus* of *Nola* (*a*) as he himſelf tells us in his Epiſtles. And from *Optatus* it is manifeſt that *Cæcilianus* Biſhop of *Carthage* was made ſo from a Deacon without ever being Ordain'd a Presbyter in order thereto. For there ariſing a diſturbance in the Church of *Carthage* about *Cæcilianus*'s being made Biſhop there, and the main objection lying againſt his Ordination becauſe Ordain'd Biſhop by *Felix* Biſhop of *Aptungitum*, whom they looked on as a Traditor, and one that had deſerted the Faith in time of Perſecution: *Optatus* tells us, (*b*) *Iterum à Cæciliano mandatum eſt ut ſi Felix in ſe ſicut illi arbitrabantur nihil contuliſſet, ipſi tanquam adhuc Diaconum ordinarent Cæcilianum*; i. e. *Cæcilianus again commanded that if Felix conferr'd nothing on him as they imagin'd, then let them* (ſpeaking to the Biſhops of the adverſe party then met together) *again ordain Cæcilanus as if he were as yet only a Deacon.* Which plainly inferrs that before *Felix* ordain'd him Biſhop, he was no more than a Deacon, And *Photius* (*c*) the learned Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* in his Epiſtle to Pope *Nicolas*, acknowledgeth that even in his time ſome Ordained Biſhops from Deacons without ever making them Presbyters, and that with ſeveral it was then looked on as the ſame thing to make a Biſhop from a Deacon as from a Presbyter without at all admitting to the intermediate Order. And a while after the ſame thing is alſo (*d*) objected to the *Latines* by the *Greeks*, and although their heats then ran very high about the aforeſaid *Photius*, yet on both ſides this is only mention'd as a breach of the Eccleſiaſtical Canons, and that thoſe were to be condemn'd that did the thing, not that the Ordination was void which was thus adminiſtred. Regularly I do acknowledge it ought to be otherwiſe, and that none be made Presbyters before they have been Deacons, or Biſhops before they have been Presbyters, and that it is always beſt for the Church to obſerve this Order. And ſo alſo muſt it be acknowledged that in all formed bodies of men, regularly none ought to be advanc'd to the higheſt Office but thoſe that have firſt gone through the inferiour, as is manifeſt in all Corporations, and that it is ever beſt for the publick good of thoſe Societies, and the well governing of them, that this Order ſhould be alwayes

(a) *Ep. 6. ad ſeverum, & Ep. 22. ad Amandum.*

(b) *Lib. 1. contra Parmenianum.*

(c) *Baron. Annal. Tom. 10. ad annum 861.*

(d) *Baron. Annal. Tom 10. ad annum 857.*

alwayes obſerv'd. But however if at firſt daſh one ſhould be plac'd in the higheſt Office, without going through the inferiour, this doth not vacate his Commiſſion receiv'd from a lawful Authority; but he is to all intents and purpoſes as fully inveſted with the whole *Power* and Authority of that Office, as if he had regularly aſcended thereto by the uſual degrees through all the ſubordinate Offices, and in the power of this one Office only hath the powers of all the others conferr'd on him, becauſe it eminently includes them all. And the ſame is to be ſaid as to thoſe that are Ordained Biſhops without going through the inferiour Orders. Although this be done contrary to the Rule of the Church yet this doth not vacate their Commiſſion which they have receiv'd by a lawful Authority at their Ordinations, but by vertue thereof they are made true Biſhops of the Church of Chriſt, and have receiv'd full power to all the Duties incumbent on them as ſuch; not only that which is peculiar to the Order of a Biſhop, but alſo the powers of all other inferiour Offices included therein. For the Orders of the Church do ſo include one the other, that the ſame Act of Ordination which gives the power of the higher Order, doth therein alſo give the powers of all other Orders inferiour thereto; as for Example, when a man is made a *Presbyter* or *Prieſt*, though he had never been a Deacon, yet he hath full power to all the Acts and Duties of a Deacon, as being included in his *Prieſthood*; and ſo when a man is made a Biſhop, though he had never been either *Prieſt* or Deacon, yet he hath full power to all the Acts and Duties of both theſe Offices, as being included in that of his Epiſcopacy: And this is no more than may be made good by Inſtances from all the ſubordinations of power in the World, in which this is alwayes moſt certain that the higher degree of power ever includes all the other Degrees inferiour thereto, and that Act which gives that one ſuperiour degree, gives all the others therewith, as included in it. And all the Argument which the *Romaniſts* bring againſt this to prove it muſt be otherwiſe as to thoſe ſeveral degrees of power in the Church which make the Offices of Biſhop, *Prieſt* and Deacon therein, is drawn from a ſimilitude they make between them, and the three ſorts of Souls which diſtinguiſh between the three ſeveral ſorts of living Creatures in this World, that is the Vegetative Soul, the Senſitive and the Rational. For as the Vegetative is neceſſarily preſuppos'd to the Senſitive, and the Senſitive to the Rational; in ſuch manner as nothing can be a Rational Creature which is not a Senſitive, or a Senſitive which is not a Vegetative, ſo ſay they the order of a Deacon is neceſſarily preſuppos'd to the order of *Prieſthood*, and the order of *Prieſthood* to that of Epiſcopacy; and no one can be a Biſhop which is not firſt a *Presbyter*, or a *Presbyter* which is not firſt a Deacon. But this Argument if it makes any thing to the purpoſe, muſt infer a very ridiculous thing, that is, that God cannot make a Man, unleſs, by giving him firſt the Vegetative Soul, he makes him a Tree or a plant; and then ſecondly, by giving him the Senſitive

tive Soul he makes him a Brute; and then thirdly and laſtly, by giving him the Rational Soul he makes him a Man; whereas nothing is more certain than that by that one Act whereby he gives the Rational Soul, he gives all the powers of the other two included therein. And therefore if this ſimilitude were to decide the Controverſie between us, inſtead of making out any thing for them, it will moſt manifeſtly give the whole on my ſide, it being one of the fulleſt and cleareſt that can be thought on moſt plainly to illuſtrate unto you the whole ſtate of what I have ſaid in this particular. For although the Vegetative Soul, as in Vegetables, is diſtinct from the Senſitive; and the Senſitive, as in Brutes, is diſtinct from the Rational; yet the Senſitive doth ſo include the Vegetative, and the Rational the Senſitive, that the very ſame act which gives the Senſitive Soul gives alſo the Vegetative, and the very ſame act which gives the Rational gives both Senſitive and Vegetative alſo included therein. And juſt ſo is it of the three Orders of Deacon, *P*rieſt and Biſhop in the Church of Chriſt. For although the Order of a Deacon in a ſimple Deacon is diſtinct from the Order of *P*rieſthood, and the *P*rieſthood as in a ſimple *P*rieſt diſtinct from the Order of Epiſcopacy, yet the Order of *P*rieſthood doth ſo include the Order of a Deacon, and the Order of Epiſcopacy both that of Prieſt and Deacon, that the very ſame act of Ordination which gives a man the Order of Prieſthood, gives him alſo that of a Deacon, and that very ſame act which gives him the Order of Epiſcopacy, gives him alſo both that of Deacon and Prieſt included in it, and conſequently that it is no more neceſſary a man ſhould be a Deacon before he can be a Prieſt, or a Prieſt before he can be a Biſhop, than that he muſt be made a Vegetable before he can be an Animal, and an Animal before he can be a Rational Creature; than which nothing is more abſurd. And thus far having ſhown you that the inferiour Orders of the Church are not ſo eſſentially neceſſary to qualifie for the ſuperiour as you imagine, but that a man may validly be ordain'd a Biſhop, though he was afore neither Prieſt nor Deacon; it will infer, that although that ſhould be true which you object againſt us, that our firſt form of Ordination of Prieſts till the Addition inſerted in the year 1662. was defective, and that by reaſon of this defect all the Prieſtly Ordinations conferr'd by it were null and void, yet our Epiſcopal Ordination may be ſtill good, as being adminiſtred by no ſuch defective Form, but by one which includes all that, and in the very ſame words which the *Romaniſts* themſelves ſay is the alone eſſential Form of their Epiſcopal Ordination, (as is afore taken notice of) and therefore though we had no true Prieſts all the while this defective Form was uſed, yet we ſtill had true Biſhops fully inveſted with the power of Ordaining others, and conſequently now at leaſt ſince the Form whereby they Ordain is mended according to your mind, we muſt have true Prieſts alſo, and therefore whatſoever defect according to your opinion might be formerly in our Prieſtly Ordination by reaſon of our Forms,

yet

yet now this defect is fully mended and ſupplied, you have no reaſon on this account to forſake our Communion.

But Thirdly, That there was never any ſuch defect in our Forms, the main miſtake which you go upon is that which in the laſt place I am to convince you of. For although before the addition inſerted in the Form of our Prieſtly Ordination, it might not be ſo well fenced againſt all the unreaſonable Cavils of Adverſaries as now it is, yet it was altogether as full in the expreſſion of what was done, and totally ſufficient for the end deſign'd, which I doubt not I ſhall fully and evidently make appear unto you by theſe following Reaſons.

I. Becauſe theſe words, [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins thou doſt forgive they are forgiven, and whoſe ſins thou doſt retain they are retained*] are as full and comprehenſive an expreſſion of the whole Prieſtly power as poſſibly can be deviſed. For what are Prieſts but the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt, to lead men to that Reconciliation with God, and that Forgiveneſs of Tranſgreſſion from him which he hath purchaſed for us? And what are the appointed means whereby they do this, but the Adminiſtring the Sacraments, the preaching of the Word, the declaring Gods Promiſes and Threats, the exhorting to Repentance and newneſs of Life, the correcting by Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures ſuch as are notorious Sinners, the Abſolving them when penitent, and the Interceſſion of Holy Prayer for all? This therefore being the end of their Calling, and theſe the Means they are to make uſe of in order thereunto, thoſe words which appoint them unto the End, muſt neceſſarily appoint them alſo to all thoſe Means leading thereto. For in this Caſe the Means are always included in the End; and whoſoever gives a Commiſſion for the accompliſhing of any End, muſt neceſſarily alſo in that Commiſſion include an Authority to all the Regular Means leading thereto. And therefore the End of the Prieſts Calling being to be the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt for the Forgiveneſs of Sins, theſe words in our Ordinal [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins thou doſt forgive they are forgiven, and whoſe ſins thou doſt retain they are retained*] which do moſt plainly appoint the Perſons Ordain'd to this end do neceſſarily appoint them alſo to all the means leading thereto; the preaching the Word, the Conſecrating as well as adminiſtring the Sacraments, and all things elſe which Chriſt hath commanded his Miniſters to do in order to this End, and conſequently they do give every branch of the Prieſtly-power which by the Inſtitutions of our Saviour do belong thereto. In anſwer to this I doubt not thoſe Gentlemen you converſe ſo much with, will tell you, that thoſe words cannot be ſo underſtood as to comprehend all thoſe Miniſterial Acts of the Prieſtly Office. Becauſe in the 20th. Chapter of St. *John*'s Goſpel from whence we as well as they own to have taken them into our Ordinals, and therein to uſe them in the ſame ſenſe as there uſed, they have according to them another interpretation, not to mean Forgiveneſs of Sins as

obtain'd

tain'd by the outward aſſiſtance of all the Miniſterial Acts of the Prieſtly Office leading, preparing and qualifying men thereto, but only as it is given by that one act thereof whereby they take upon them in their Sacrament of Penance (as they call it) properly, directly and abſolutely by a judicial Sentence to forgive the ſins of thoſe that Confeſs unto them. For ſuch an Authority thoſe Uſurpers upon the power of God Almighty claim to themſelves, and alledging this Text of Scripture as the Charter by which they hold it, will not have it to be underſtood of any thing elſe, and in the Council of *Trent* thunder out their *Anathema* againſt all thoſe that underſtand it to extend to any other act of the Prieſtly Office but this only. For the words of that Council are *Seſs.* 14. *Can.* 3. *If any one ſhall ſay that thoſe words of our Saviour* [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins thou doſt forgive they are forgiven, and whoſe ſins thou doſt retain they are retained*] *are not to be underſtood of the power of remitting and retaining ſins in the Sacrament of Pennance, as the Catholick Church ever underſtood from the beginning, but wreſt them contrary to the Inſtitution of the Sacrament, to the Authority of Preaching the Goſpel, Let him be accurſed.* In Anſwer to which I will ſhew you,

1. That there is no ſuch power given to the Prieſt, as is claimed by them from thoſe words.

And 2. That therefore they can be underſtood in no other ſenſe than that which comprehends the whole Prieſtly power, as I have already explain'd. And,

1. The power which they claim from theſe words is to be Judges on Earth in Chriſt's ſtead between God and Man, and to have full Authority as ſuch to paſs ſentence upon all that after Baptiſm ſhall fall into Tranſgreſſion, either for Life or Death, according as they ſhall judge fitting, and therefore call all ſuch to their Tribunal, telling them that *Chriſt* (a) *hath conſtituted them Judges upon Earth with ſuch a power that without their Sentence of Abſolution none that have fallen into ſin after Baptiſm can be again reconciled unto God.* And therefore they make their Sentence of Abſolution to be that very Act whereby the Sin is forgiven, and take from God that Prerogative which he hath reſerved to himſelf alone. *For* (b) *it is he only that blotteth out tranſgreſſions*, and (c) *none other is a God like him that pardoneth iniquity*; and therefore was it that the *Jews* when our Saviour ſaid, *thy ſins are forgiven thee*, reaſoning among themſelves, asked the Queſtion, (d) *Who can forgive ſins but God alone*; and this ſaith *Tertullian*, (e) *They deſervedly did as not knowing his Divinity.* For then it was a thing looked on as moſt certain amongſt all the Scribes and Doctors of the *Jewiſh* Church, that none but God alone could forgive Sin, and ſo was it alſo by the Ancient Fathers of the Church of Chriſt. And therefore

(a) *Bellarm. de Panitentia lib.* 3. *cap.* 2.

(b) Iſa. 43. v. 25.
(c) Mic. 7. v. 18.

(d) Mar. 2. v. 7. Luk. 5. v. 22.
(e) *Lib* 4. *adverſ. Marcion. c.* 10.

therefore they make this one of their greateſt Arguments, whereby they prove the Divinity of our Saviour, that he did forgive Sins. For ſaith *Irenæus*, (f) *If none can forgive ſins but God alone, and our Lord did forgive them, it is manifeſt that he was the Word of God, made the Son of Man.* And the ſame Argument is alſo made uſe of by (g) St. *Hilary*, (h) St. *Athanaſius*, (i) St. *Cyril*, (k) St. *Ambroſe*, (l) St. *Chryſoſtom*, and (m) St. *Jerome*, and in the Ages after by (n) *Venerable Bede*, and ſeveral others; which ſufficiently ſhows that they never underſtood any ſuch pardoning power as thoſe men now claim ever to be given to man, but to be alwayes reſerv'd unto God alone. That the Paſtors of the Church of Chriſt have Authority to apply the Promiſes of God to all his People, by declaring Abſolution from Sin to all that truly Repent, and on the other hand to denounce his Puniſhments againſt all that continue in iniquity, I freely grant; and alſo that they have power for the better Government of the Church by way of Diſcipline to exclude all ſuch from Communion who are open and notorious Sinners, and reſtore them again when amended by Repentance. But as to that power of the Prieſt now claim'd in the Church of *Rome* of remitting Sins properly, directly, and abſolutely by a Judicial Sentence, and that none can be reconciled to God unleſs thus abſolved by them, or at leaſt ſupplying the defect by an earneſt deſire of their Abſolution when not readily to be had, (as (*) in perfect Contrition they will allow) is what God never gave unto them, or the ancient Fathers of the Church ever challenged. For the looſing of men by the Judgment of the Prieſt, which the Ancients ſpeak of cannot be underſtood of any ſuch extravagant power granted unto them, but only of that power of Diſcipline of which I have ſpoken, whereby they reſtored ſuch to the peace of the Church, and admitted them again to Communion who had afore been excluded from it. And their Language concerning this matter is generally ſuch as will admit no other Interpretation. For they moſtly expreſs it by the Terms of *bringing them to Communion*, of *reconciling them to the Communion*, or *with the Communion*, *reſtoring the Communion to them*, *admitting them to Fellowſhip*, *granting them Peace*, and ſuch like. Neither do we find that they did ever uſe any formal Abſolution as this, *I Abſolve thee*; but their reconciling them to the Church, and receiving them again to Communion who had been excluded from it, was the only way of Abſolving then in practice among them; which was ſo far from that extravagant power of abſolving now challenged by the *Romiſh* Prieſts, that it was looked on as no more than what a Deacon could do, and accordingly

(f) *Adverſus Hæreſ.* lib. 5. c. 17.

(g) *Comm. in 9. Matth.* (h) *Orat. 3. cont. Arrianos.* (i) *In lib. de recta fide ad Reginas.* (k) *In cap. 5. Luc.* (l) *In 9. Mat. Hom. 29.* (m) *Lib. 1. com. in 9. Matthæi.* (n) *In Marc* lib. 1. cap. 10.

* *Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 14. cap. 4.*

in the abſence of the Prieſt was it Cuſtomary to be performed by them in the *Weſtern* Churches, and that not only in the days of St. ‖ *Cyprian*, but alſo down as far as the time of † *Alcuinus*, who lived eight hundred years after Chriſt. And afterwards when Prieſts began to appropriate this power ſolely to themſelves, and Forms of Abſolution came into the Church in the latter Ages, they were at firſt always by way of Prayer and Interceſſion to God for the perſons abſolv'd, and it was not till *Thomas Aquinas*'s time * about 400 years ſince that this Authoritative Form *I Abſolve thee* was ever made uſe of; and that came not in without great oppoſition from many Learned Men of that time, as *Gulielmus Altiſiodorenſis*, *Gulielmus Pariſienſis*, *Hugo Cardinalis*, and ſeveral others, who were then ſo far from allowing any ſuch power in Prieſts, as now challenged, that they plainly declare, that to remit Sins and the Eternal puniſhments due unto them, was ſo properly the work of God alone, that the Abſolution of the Prieſt can operate nothing at all that way, but muſt always preſuppoſe the Abſolution of God going before it, as being no more than the reſtoring of thoſe to the peace of the Church which had been afore by their true Repentance reſtor'd to peace with God. The words of *Hugo Cardinalis* are, (a) *The Prieſt cannot bind or looſe with or from the Bond of the fault and the puniſhment due thereunto, but only declare him to be bound or looſ'd, as the Levitical Prieſt did not make or cleanſe the Leper, but only declare him to be infected or clean.* And to the ſame purpoſe ſpeaks alſo *Peter Lumbard* the Maſter of the Sentences, and much more fully in theſe words, (b) *God alone doth forgive and retain Sins, and yet he hath given power of binding and looſing unto the Church, but he bindeth and looſeth one way, the Church another. For he only by himſelf forgiveth ſin, who both cleanſeth the Soul from the inward blot, and looſeth it from the debt of Everlaſting Death. But this hath he not granted unto Prieſts, to whom notwithſtanding he hath given the power of binding and looſing, that is to ſay, of declaring men to be bound or looſed. Whereupon the Lord did firſt by himſelf reſtore Health to the Leper, and then ſent him to the Prieſts, by whoſe Judgment he might be declared to be cleanſed; ſo alſo he offer'd Lazarus to his Diſciples to be looſed, having firſt quickned him.* And again a little after, (c) *In remitting or retaining Sins, the Prieſts of the Goſpel have that Right and Office which the Legal Prieſts had of old under the Law, in curing of the Lepers. Theſe therefore forgive ſins or retain them, whilſt they ſhew and declare that they are forgiven or retained by God.* Which ſayings do plainly inferre, that to pardon the Crime and remit the puniſhment is the proper work of God only; and that the Abſolution of the Prieſts hath no real operation at all that way, but muſt

‖ *Epiſt.* 13.
† Alcuin. *de diviſis officiis* cap. 13.
* Aquin. *Opuſc.* 22. cap. 5.
(a) *In Matthæum* cap. 16.
(b) *Lib.* 4. *diſtinct.* 18. c. f.
(c) *Ibid.* f.

muſt preſuppoſe the party to be firſt abſolv'd and juſtify'd by God, their abſolution being only declarative of what God hath afore done, in applying the promiſes of God for the Remiſſion of Sins to all ſuch as have truly repented, for their Conſolation and Comfort, rather than that the leaſt ſtain of their Guilt is removed thereby. To the outward peace of the Church indeed ſuch abſolutions can reſtore men, but not to peace with God, unleſs a true and hearty Repentance hath done it before, and if after this on the evident manifeſtation of the Repentance the Abſolution of the Prieſt comes, it is only to declare what God hath done before, not to add or in the leaſt to conduce any thing thereto, ſo as any pardon or forgiveneſs ſhould follow his Sentence which was not granted or given before by God himſelf, who is he alone that can do it. And not only thoſe two whoſe words I have laid down do ſay this, but alſo ſeveral others, who are now reckon'd amongſt the eminenteſt Doctors and chiefeſt Fathers of the *Romiſh* Church that lived in their times; as *Gulielmus Altiſiodorenſis*, *Alexander Halenſis*, *Bonaventura*, *Occham*, *Gabriel Biel*, and others. And to ſay otherwiſe would be to run Counter to the whole Tenor of the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt. For therein Faith and newneſs of Life are laid down as the ſtated terms on which alone men ſhall become capable of that pardon from God, which Chriſt hath purchaſed for us; and if men arrive to that meaſure thereof which God requires, they will be moſt certainly pardon'd, whether the Prieſt will or no, and if not, all the Abſolutions in the World ſhall do them no good. And therefore for to ſay as the *Romaniſts* do, that without their Abſolution the moſt penitent cannot be reconciled to God, and that with it even the wicked can, ſuch as are only attrite (as they call them) is a Doctrine I confeſs well devis'd for their own Intereſt, Grandeur, and Empire over men, but ſo far from having any foundation in the Goſpel, that nothing can be more contrary thereto: For it overthrows the main deſign of it in making men rely upon their falſe pretended power of Abſolution for the gaining Reconciliation with God, inſtead of addicting themſelves to that Holineſs and Righteouſneſs of Life in order thereto, which it is the main aim of the Goſpel to lead us into. And herein it is in the higheſt degree injurious both to God and Men. To God it is injurious, becauſe it robs him of his power of forgiving Sins to give it unto men, abſolutely excluding him from it without their forgiving them firſt at their Abſolutions: And it is injurious unto men, becauſe it cheats them of their Souls in making them rely upon falſe hopes for the Salvation of them, whereby Thouſands and Ten Thouſands have been undone for ever. For thereby they are taught, that though they be attrite only, that is, have only that Carnal Sorrow for Sin which ariſeth from fear of the puniſhments due thereto, without any of that true ſaving Repentance which is founded on the Love of God, yet this ſo imperfect a tendency to Repentance ſhall by Confeſſion and the Abſolution of a Prieſt applied thereon be made ſo perfect as

to be fully ſufficient to blot out the guilt and render the man clean and pure from all his Tranſgreſſion, whereby it comes to paſs that Carnal men who are eaſily perſwaded to approve of that Doctrine, which ſhall make the enjoyment of their Luſts and the Hopes of Salvation conſiſtent together, totally acquieſceing herein, never think of that true Sorrow which worketh Repentance unto Salvation: But after a glut of ſinning having frighted themſelves by reflecting on the puniſhments due thereto, into a kind of ſorrow for it, which they call attrition, in this caſe for the remedy of all only apply to the Prieſt for his Abſolution, never denied to any ſo prepared, and when they have this, looking on all old ſcores quite wiped off thereby, run on anew in the ſame courſe of Iniquity, till another ſuch fright ſends them again for another Abſolution; and when that is obtain'd, then to ſinning again as before, and ſo on in the ſame round, from Abſolution to Tranſgreſſion, and from Tranſgreſſion to Abſolution, without ever thinking of any other way of ſaving their Souls, till at laſt Death overtakes them in a ſtate of total impenitency, and they become utterly loſt and undone for ever. And it is to be feared that they have in that Church deluded more men into Hell by this one Doctrine only, than they have led to Heaven by all the other they have taught. And thus far having ſhown you that there is no ſuch power at all given to Prieſts, as from theſe words of St. *John* [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins*, &c.] it will neceſſarily follow that no other meaning can be affixed unto them than what I have explain'd unto you, and therefore they muſt neceſſarily include not this pardoning power alone, as the *Romaniſts* will have (there being none ſuch at all given) but all the Miniſterial Duties of the Prieſtly Office which Chriſt hath appointed to bring men unto God and reconcile them unto him, and hence is it that the Holy Apoſtle St. *Paul* ſaith, that there is (a) *given unto us the miniſtry of reconciliation.* For our Office doth conſiſt in this that we are appointed the Miniſters of Chriſt to reconcile men unto God. And if any one undertakes the office of reconciling a Rebellious Son unto his Father, the way whereby he is to effect this, is not by pardoning the Son all the faults he hath committed; a power which none can imagine the Father would ever give out of his own hand, but by bringing the Son to ſuch Terms of Submiſſion and Amendment, as that the Father may think fit himſelf to pardon him, and accept him again to his Favour. And this is the Caſe with us, who are made the Miniſters of Chriſt to Reconcile men unto God our Heavenly Father againſt whom we have all Rebell'd. The way whereby we are to accompliſh this, is not by taking upon us in God's ſtead to pardon and abſolve from Sin all that have offended againſt him, this being a power which God will never give from himſelf to any, but all that we have to do in order to it, is to make uſe of thoſe means which Chriſt hath appointed to bring men to ſuch terms of Repentance and Newneſs of Life

(a) 2 Cor. cap. 5. v. 18.

life as God may think fit himſelf to pardon them and receive them to his Mercy. And theſe means are the preaching of the Word, the adminiſtring of the Sacraments, the interceſſion of Prayer, and the publick Diſcipline of the Church. For by preaching the Goſpel we make it (*a*) *the word of Reconciliation* to all that believe: by the Sacrament of Baptiſm we give the Spirit (*b*) of Regeneration, and admit men into the Covenant of Grace (*c*) *for the remiſſion of ſins*: by the Holy Euchariſt we adminiſter to their growth in Grace, and reach out unto them (*d*) *the blood of the Covenant ſhed for many for the remiſſion of ſins*: by our Diſcipline, Offenders are corrected and (*e*) *reſtored* again to the right way from whence they had deviated: And by our *prayers* (*f*) *of Faith* God is entreated for his people. And theſe being the only means whereby men can attain to the Mercies of God for the pardon of their Sins, we that adminiſter to them theſe means may be ſaid in ſome ſenſe alſo to pardon them, not abſolutely and directly, but in the ſame manner as a Phyſitian cures his ſick Patient, not by giving the Health, for this is only Gods work, but only by adminiſtring the means. For it is very frequent to aſcribe the effect to thoſe that adminiſter the means to diſpoſe towards it, though they have no hand at all in the efficiency it ſelf, whereby it is brought to paſs, and in this ſenſe is it that theſe words of our Saviour in the Goſpel of St. *John* are to be underſtood, *Whoſoever ſins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whoſoever ſins ye retain they are retained.* Not that Chriſt gave unto his Apoſtles thereby an abſolute power to remit ſins, but that he committed to them the Adminiſtration of all thoſe means, whereby alone Remiſſion was to be obtain'd. So that whoſoever would receive from them the benefit of thoſe means ſhould thereby have their ſins remitted unto them, and whoſoever would not, ſhould have them retain'd for ever. And in this ſence is it that *John Ferus* a Commentator of the *Romiſh* Communion who writ about 150 years ſince underſtands the words, for ſaith he in the Explication of them, *Though it be the proper work of God to remit ſins, yet are the Apoſtles ſaid to remit them alſo not ſimply, but becauſe they apply thoſe means, whereby God doth remit ſins, which means are the word of God and his Sacraments.* For theſe means of Salvation with the reſt I have mention'd are the Keys which Chriſt hath given to his Miniſters whereby the Gates of Heaven are open'd to all ſuch as will receive the Goſpel at their hands, and become obedient thereto, and for ever ſhut againſt all that will not. For by theſe only are men let in to Everlaſting Life, and without theſe all muſt be excluded from it for ever, there being no other means but theſe alone eſtabliſh'd by our Saviour whereby men can be admitted to partake of that Salvation he hath purchaſed for us, or be made capable of that Reconciliation with God required

(*a*) 2 Cor. 5 v. 19.
(*b*) Joh. 3. v. 5.
(*c*) Mar. 16. v 16. Acts 2. v. 38.
(*d*) Mat. 26. v. 28.
(*e*) Gal. 6. v. 1.
(*f*) Jam. 5. v. 15, 16.

requir'd in order thereto. And therefore thoſe means being thus neceſſary to gain us pardon and forgiveneſs, ſo that by them only it can be obtain'd, and without them never granted to any; hence is it, that our Saviour when he committed to his Apoſtles the Power and Authority of adminiſtring thoſe means he expreſſeth it in theſe words, [*Whoſeſoever ſins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whoſeſoever ſins ye retain, they are retained,*] implying thereby that he made them the Miniſters of reconciling men to God for the Pardon of their Sins, and intruſted them with all the means in order thereto, ſo that to whomſoever the benefit of their Miniſtry in the applying of thoſe means ſhould be extended, Pardon and Forgiveneſs ſhould be adminiſtred thereby, and to whomſoever it ſhould not, it ſhould be denyed for ever. And in this ſence the Miniſters of the Goſpel may be ſaid to remit or retain ſins, becauſe they alone adminiſter the means whereby they are remitted, and without which they are retain'd for ever. But yet ſo that the Miniſtry is only theirs, the Power totally Gods; they only do the outward Act, God alone gives the Spiritual Effect. And this being the ſence and meaning of the words, they do in as full and comprehenſive a manner include the whole Prieſtly power, as poſſibly could in ſo few words be deviſed, and conſequently muſt in as full and perfect a manner give it to all that are ordain'd to the Prieſthood by them. For they appointing us to the End for which we are made Miniſters, that is to bring men unto God for the pardon of their Sins, muſt neceſſarily appoint us alſo to all the means which are ordained in order thereto: The preaching the Word, the adminiſtring the Sacraments, the reconciling of Penitents, the interceſſion of Prayer, and whatſoever elſe can be ſaid to be any branch of the Prieſtly Office; and although it muſt be confeſs'd that we do not allow the Prieſtly power to extend ſo far as our Adverſaries of *Rome* will have it, yet this can move no Controverſie in this matter, becauſe the words being ſo general as to inſtitute and appoint us to what is on all ſides allow'd to be the ſole end of our Office that is to be Miniſters of Chriſt for the forgiveneſs of ſins to thoſe to whom we are ſent, they muſt neceſſarily include whatſoever Chriſt hath ordain'd as a means to be adminiſtred by us in order thereto, and therefore if Chriſt hath appointed all thoſe things to be branches of the Prieſtly power, which they aſſert, they muſt neceſſarily be all contain'd in theſe words, and the power of adminiſtring them alſo be given to all that are ordain'd to the Prieſthood by them, and conſequently the Form in which they are contain'd is ſo far from being chargeable with the defect you mention of not expreſſing the whole Prieſtly power, that how large ſoever you may think the Prieſtly power to be, it is abundantly ſufficient to expreſs it all, becauſe in ſo clearly and perfectly expreſſing the whole End for which we are made Prieſts, it alſo neceſſarily includeth all the means that Chriſt hath appointed us to adminiſter in order thereto,

thereto, and all the powers which he hath given to qualify us for it, how many and how large ſoever they may be.

II. To convince you further of the ſufficiency of this Form for Prieſtly Ordination, I deſire you again to conſider what was urged by Mr. *Earbury* at the Conference you gave me an account of, that theſe words [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe Sins you* &c.] are the very ſame wherewith Chriſt Ordain'd his Apoſtles; and therefore if they be not ſufficient to make us Prieſts, they could not be ſufficient to make them Prieſts, and conſequently through this defect there are no Prieſts at all in the Church of Chriſt. For if Chriſt did not ſufficiently give the office and power of Prieſthood, it was not ſufficiently receiv'd, and conſequently there muſt be no ſuch thing at all among us. And therefore thoſe who on this account deny us our Orders, while they are ſo earneſt to caſt this Reproach upon us, do not only ſtrike at us, but through our ſides do wound even the Holy Apoſtles alſo, and Chriſt himſelf; becauſe the ſame Argument which they urge againſt us from the inſufficiency of the Form to invalidate our Orders, invalidates thoſe of the Holy Apoſtles themſelves, and blaſphemouſly accuſeth Chriſt our Lord of inſufficiently giving them the Miſſion on which they were ſent. But you tell me of a *Salvo* that Mr. *Acton* hath found for all this, by anſwering, *That though with us nothing could be a true Form which did not expreſs the Power given, yet with our Saviour it was ſufficient though it did not, who being God could do that which no other could, and therefore with him any thing which he ſhould pleaſe to make uſe of, that did not expreſs the power given, was a good and ſufficient Form though the ſame would not be ſo with us.* But this is ſo ſtrange a piece of Divinity, as ſufficiently ſhows that Gentleman was put to a very hard puſh, when he was forced to give this in anſwer to what was urged againſt him; and truly it is ſo plainly abſurd in it ſelf, and impious in its Conſequences, that I thought not at firſt that I needed ſay any thing to make it appear ſo unto you, and therefore took no notice of it in the Anſwers I ſent you to your firſt Paper; but ſince I find in your Letters after, that you are ſo fond of it as to think it a very good Anſwer to whatſoever ſhall be urg'd on this Argument, I deſire you would conſider theſe following particulars.

1. That this Anſwer plainly alledging the Form whereby Chriſt Ordained his Apoſtles Prieſts, to be in it ſelf imperfect and inſufficient, doth make that Ordination to be defective in that which the *Romaniſts* account the prime and main eſſential of it. And to bring in the Divinity of our Saviour as a *Salvo* doth not at all mend the matter, but makes it much worſe, becauſe it chargeth him, even with his Divinity too, of doing that which is in it ſelf imperfect and inſufficient, and of being guilty thereby of a defect, in one of the principal Acts whereby he conſtituted his Church, that is in Ordaining thoſe Paſtors and Governours over it to whoſe Care it was to be committed. A

thing

thing which cannot be ſaid of him that is infinitely perfect in all his doings, without the higheſt Blaſphemy againſt him. To ſay, *That Chriſt as God could do what no other could*, is indeed true as to all acts of his Divine Power, and it is in vain for any of us to endeavour to do as he doth in any thing of this nature, wherein he is infinitely above our utmoſt imitation. But in things of Moral and Religious practice, which we are to do likewiſe, our ſafeſt way is always to come as near as we can to what he hath done before us, and we are ever beſt ſecured from Error or Defect when we do ſo. For in all things of this Nature he is our grand Exemplar, whoſe ſteps we are to follow, and whoſe Actions we are to Copy after as far as we are able, and as long as we do this it is impoſſible that either defect or flaw can be found in any of our doings: For by his Divinity he is infinitely perfect in his Nature, and infinitely perfect in all his Doings, and no Act of his can ever have the leaſt imperfection or inſufficiency therein. But when any of his Works are ſuch as we muſt not pretend to do after him, the reaſon of this always is from that height of Perfection in them which we cannot reach, and not from any imperfection which makes them unwarrantable for us to do likewiſe. And therefore to ſay that our Saviour by vertue of his Divinity could do that which would not be juſtifiable for us to do after him, by reaſon of any imperfection or inſufficiency to be found therein, as your Anſwerer plainly doth, is no leſs than the higheſt Blaſphemy againſt him.

2. I deſire you to conſider, that by the ſame words whereby Chriſt Ordained his Apoſtles to be his Miniſters in his Church, he Ordained alſo the very Office it ſelf: For then he firſt inſtituted the Office, when he firſt appointed them to it, and therefore thoſe words by which our Saviour firſt Ordain'd his Apoſtles for the Office of his Miniſtry, are ſo far from being defective in the Expreſſion of the Power thereof, that it is impoſſible it can have any power at all but what is expreſſed by them. For they are the Original Charter of its Inſtitution, and from whence alone the limits and extent of its Authority are to be known. And therefore we may very well judge of the extent of the Office, from its Correſpondency with the Words, but not of the ſufficiency of the Words from their Correſpondency with what we think the extent of the Office; becauſe the Office it ſelf being firſt inſtituted by theſe Words, can have nothing in it but what is expreſſed by them And therefore if it be the ſame Office of Prieſthood we receive at our Ordinations, which Chriſt Ordain'd his Apoſtles to, certainly the ſame words which he then made uſe of muſt always be the perfecteſt form whereby to make expreſſion thereof. Had the Office been afore inſtituted and afterwards expreſs'd by halfes, we could then have recourſe to the firſt inſtitution to make clear eviction hereof, and from thence the deficiency would plainly be made out: But that the words of its firſt inſtitution from whence it received its whole being and eſtabliſhment ſhould be imperfect or deficient is

that

that which cannot be ſaid, unleſs you will accuſe the Inſtitutor Chriſt our Lord of being deficient in the Inſtitution it ſelf, and not making and appointing the Office as well and as perfectly as he ought, a Conſequence which I ſuppoſe your Anſwerer will by no means be willing to own.

3. This Anſwer is not that which the *Romaniſts* ever uſe to give in this Caſe, or will the Gentleman you had it from, I ſuppoſe, abide by it, however it came to drop from him. For when the perfection of this Form is urged from this, that it was the ſame by which our Saviour ordained his Apoſtles, their uſual anſwer is, That there are two powers in the Prieſtly Office, the power of Order, and the power of Juriſdiction as I have afore explained; the former of which they ſay was given the Apoſtles by our Saviour before his Crucifiction at his laſt Supper, when he ſaid unto them [*This do in remembrance of me*,] and that it was the later only which was given after his Reſurrection, by theſe words [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins*, &c.] for the conferring of which they allow this Form to be moſt full and ſufficient, and for that purpoſe uſe it in their own Ordinal; but deny it to comprehend any other branch of the prieſtly Office, or that our Saviour intended to confer any other thereby. And this you your ſelf ſeem well enough to underſtand, you having expreſſed as much in one of your Letters. But this alſo goes upon two very great miſtakes;

1. That Chriſt Ordain'd his Apoſtles prieſts of the New Covenant, when he ſaid unto them at his laſt Supper [*This do in remembrance of me.*

2. That Chriſt Ordain'd any at all to be Miniſters of his Church before he had actually purchas'd it by the ſhedding of his bloud. And,

1. It is a great miſtake that our Saviour Ordained his Apoſtles Prieſts of the New Covenant by thoſe words at his laſt Supper [*This do in remembrance of me*] For this is not a command particular to them to Conſecrate and Adminiſter that Sacrament which Chriſt then Inſtituted, but to all the Faithful alſo to be partakers of it, which the words plainly infer; for what elſe can the Command [*This do*] refer to, but to the whole Sacramental Action before mention'd, the receiving and eating which belong alſo to the Laity as well as the Bleſſing and Conſecrating, which is the Duty of the Prieſt only. And if the words be not ſo underſtood, there will be no Command of our Saviour obliging the Laity to be partakers of this Sacrament at all, but the Prieſts may be always left to Conſecrate it and eat it themſelves, as, contrary to all primitive practice and many Canons of the Church they now-a-days for the moſt part do. Nay further they will be under no obligation to partake of it, but only to Bleſs and Conſecrate it; and ſo if this Interpretation takes place, the whole Inſtitution may become fruſtrate thereby, and the Law of our Saviour be abſolutely made of none effect for the ſake of the Traditions and Inventions of Men. And therefore *Eſtius* an eminent Doctor of the *Romiſh* Church [redacted] plainly acknowledgeth that this Com-

mand of our Saviour [*This do in remembrance of me*] muſt extend to all the people. His words are, * *Paulus* 1 Cor. 11. *illud facere etiam ad plebem refert edentem & bibentem de hoc Sacramento quando ait, hoc facite*, i. e. *Paul in the Eleventh Chapter of his firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians plainly refers that of doing to the People eating and drinking of this Sacrament, when he ſaith in the words of our Saviour* (ver. 25.) [*This do*, &c.] And to ſay otherwiſe would be to run Counter to all the ancient Doctors of the Church, there being none of them for many hundred years after Chriſt that ever underſtood thoſe words of our Saviour in that ſence which now the Church of *Rome* will have, but always looked on them as a general precept belonging to all Chriſtians of obſerving that Holy Rite in Remembrance of his Death and Paſſion in the ſame manner as was then inſtituted by him. But when the practice of the half Communion became to be generally receiv'd in the Church of *Rome*, then the Schoolmen being put to their ſhifts to reconcile it with the Inſtitution of our Saviour who himſelf Celebrated it, and alſo commanded the Celebration of it in both kinds, at laſt lighted on this fetch of making the Apoſtles *Prieſts* by theſe words of our Saviour [*This do in remembrance of me*] ſpoken by him after his giving them the Bread; and therefore ſay that the Cup which was Adminiſtred afterwards, was given them only as *Prieſts*, and that the Laity are not at all to be admitted thereto by vertue of that Command.

* *Eſius in Sentent.* lib. 4. diſtinct 12. Sect. 11.

But here it is to be obſerv'd that our Saviour ſpake theſe words, [*This do in remembrance of me*] * twice in that Inſtitution, firſt after the diſtributing of the Bread, and then again after the giving of the Cup: And therefore if Chriſt made them *Prieſts* by thoſe words, it will follow, That either he made them *Prieſts* twice, a Doctrine which the Church of *Rome* will by no means allow, (Orders being a Sacrament, as they ſay, never without the guilt of Sacriledge to be reiterated on any) or elſe that the laſt ſaying of thoſe words as well as the firſt did both equally concur to the conferring of that Office upon them, and conſequently that they were not made perfect *Prieſts* till the Ordination was compleated by the laſt ſaying of them after the Cup was Adminiſtred, which clearly overthrows their whole Hypotheſis.

* 1 *Cor.* 11. 24, 25.

2. Our Saviour was ſo far from making his Apoſtles *Prieſts* of the New Covenant at his laſt Supper, that nothing can be a greater miſtake than to ſuppoſe that he ſhould at all Ordain any ſuch before he had actually by his Death and *Paſſion* purchaſed and Eſtabliſh'd that Church wherein they were to Miniſter. Our Saviour indeed at his firſt chooſing of them to be always with him deſigned them for this Office, and all along the time of his Miniſtry here on Earth, taught them and inſtructed them in order thereunto: And ſo alſo an Heir expectant of a Crown may deſign ſome of his Followers to be his Officers and Miniſters of State in his Kingdom, but cannot actually conſtitute

conſtitute them as ſuch till he himſelf be actually poſſeſt of the Soveraign power to enable him thereto. Neither can our Saviour be ſaid actually to have inveſted his Apoſtles with the Offices he deſigned them for, till he had actually poſſeſt himſelf of that Kingdom, his Church, in which they were to Miniſter before him, and thereby receiv'd that power which he was to delegate to them, which cannot be ſaid till after his Death and Paſſion. For till then the Chriſtian Church it ſelf could not have any Being, that being the act of Redemption whereby our Saviour firſt purchaſed it to himſelf, and laid the foundation of its Eſtabliſhment; and all the whole œconomy thereof bears reference thereto and totally commenceth from it. Till then the former œconomy of the Jewiſh Church remained in its full force. For the Sacrifices and Ceremonies of it in which it did conſiſt, being all Types of that great and truly propitiatory Sacrifice of our Saviour, whereby the work of our Redemption was wrought, and appointed to prefigure and foreſhow it, till that Sacrifice it ſelf ſhould be actually offer'd once for all: Till that was done it was neceſſarily to continue in its full Obligation to all thoſe Obſervances. And therefore our Saviour himſelf even to the time of his Death paid full Obedience to them. But when that Sacrifice was actually offer'd, and our Saviour gave himſelf up unto death upon the Croſs to be a propitiation for us, and thereby compleated that great work of our ſalvation for which he came among us, then all the Types ceaſed, at the fulfilling of the thing Typified, all thoſe ſhadows of good things to come totally vaniſhed at the appearance of the things themſelves which they foreſhowed, and the whole Law became fulfilled thereby, and all the intents and meanings thereof totally accompliſhed. And therefore by this great work of our Salvation the whole *Jewiſh* œconomy receiving its completion, and all the Legal Inſtitutions thereof abſolutely ceaſing by being fulfill'd, *Matth.* 5. *v.* 17. thenceforth the Chriſtian ſucceeded in its ſtead, that Church, that Kingdom of our Saviour, which by this his bloud-ſhedding he purchaſed to himſelf; and therefore from that time being fully inveſted with the whole Soveraignty over the Church of God, he tells his Holy Apoſtles that (a) *All power was given unto him in Heaven and in Earth*: In the Explication of which words *Maldonat* the Jeſuit tells us, "(b) Loquitur hic non de qualibet poteſtate, ſed de eâ " quam Apoſtolis dabat, *i. e.* de poteſtate Regni ſui ſpiritu- " alis acquirendi colligendique quam ad rem Apoſtolos mit- " tebat, & ita loquitur, quaſi eam poteſtatem ante reſurrectionem non ha- " buerit, nam tanquam de re nova, dicit *data eſt mihi omnis poteſtas, i. e.* " He ſpeaketh not of every power, but only of that which he gave his A- " poſtles, that is the power of acquiring and gathering his ſpiritual King- " dom, for which purpoſe he ſent his Apoſtles, and he ſpeaks ſo as if he " had not that power before his Reſurrection, for he ſaith as of a thing

(a) Matth. c. 28. v. 18.

(b) *Com. in* Mat. cap. 28. v. 18.

" newly done *all power is given unto me*, &c. and a little after, De eâ
" denique loquitur poteſtate de quâ apud Johannem dicit,
(c) cap. 16. v. 33. " (c) *Confidite, ego vici mundum*, hanc ſibi poteſtatem per
" mortem & reſurrectionem ſuam datam eſſe dicit, quia
(d) Phil. cap. 2. v. 9, 10. " eam meruit, (d) *propter quod*, inquit, *exaltavit eum &*
" *dedit illi nomen quod eſſet ſuper omne nomen, ut in nomine*
" *Jeſu omne genu flectatur Cœleſtium, Terreſtrium, & infer-*
" *norum, hoc eſt, data eſt mihi omnis poteſtas in Cælo & in Terrâ*, quâ pote-
" ſtate ad propagandos Regni ſui fines Apoſtolos mittit, ut rectiſſime mihi
" videtur Vigilius interpretari, *i. e.* And finally he ſpeaks of that power
" concerning which he ſaith in the Goſpel of St. *John*, *Be of good cheer I have*
" *overcome the world*; this power he ſaith was given him by his Death and
" Reſurrection becauſe he deſerved it, *Wherefore he ſaith God hath highly*
" *exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at the*
" *name of Jeſus every knee ſhould bow of things in Heaven, things on Earth,*
" *and things under the Earth*; that is, *there is given me all power in Heaven*
" *and in Earth*, by which power he ſent his Apoſtles to propagate his King-
" dom, as *Vigilius* ſeems to me moſt rightly to Interpret. So far the Learned Jeſuit and if you will acquieſce in his Interpretation it plainly follows from hence, that Chriſt did not receive the power of his ſpiritual Kingdom till after his Reſurrection, and that by vertue of that power it was that he ſent his Apoſtles on their Miſſion as his Miniſters to propagate this his Kingdom, and therefore that they could not receive this Miſſion, or be Ordain'd thereto till after his Reſurrection. And if we examine all the Goſpels to find by what words of his he gave them this Miſſion after his Reſurrection, and inveſted them with the power and Authority of it, it muſt be acknowledged that they could be none other but thoſe of St. *John* [*Whoſe ſoever ſins ye remit, they are remitted unto them*; *and whoſe ſoever ſins ye retain, they are retained*] for every thing elſe which was then done or ſaid at the ſpeaking of them manifeſtly infers it. Our Saviour firſt ſayes unto them [*As my Father hath ſent me, even ſo ſend I you*]; which plainly declares his then giving them their Miſſion; after that [*he breathed on them*] for his putting of his Spirit upon them, and ſaid, [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*] that is, for the ſpiritual Office on which they were ſent; (for as to thoſe extraordinary Gifts which ſo wonderfully enabled them for the Execution of it, he was not given till afterwards in the day of Pentecoſt) and what can be more plain and clear than all this is, that our Saviour was then giving his Commiſſion to his Holy Apoſtles for the Miniſtry to which he had choſen them? And therefore thoſe words that follow [*Whoſe ſoever ſins ye remit, they are remitted unto them*; *and whoſe ſoever ſins ye retain, they are retained*] muſt be they whereby the whole power and Authority of that their Miniſtry was given unto them, and not a part of it only as the *Romaniſts* ſay, and conſequently theſe words

muſt

muſt be the perfecteſt and moſt authentic form whereby to Ordain others alſo to the ſame Miniſtry.

III. But our Church in the firſt eſtabliſhing of this Form for Preiſtly Ordination, did not only appoint theſe words of our Saviour whereby he Ordained his Apoſtles, but alſo out of their abundant caution as if they foreſaw the Cavils our Adverſaries now make, by way of Explication ſubjoyned theſe other words alſo, [*And be thou a faithful Diſpenſer of the Word of God, and of his Sacraments*] by them explicitly expreſſing all the Prieſtly power in particular which we underſtand in general to be implicitly contain'd in the other that go before, as I have already made out unto you that they are. And although this ſhould not be the true Explication of them as our Adverſaries contend, yet ſince the words are part of the Form, they muſt give all that they expreſs, and therefore ſince they expreſs the whole Prieſtly power, though the other ſhould not, they muſt give it alſo to all thoſe that are Ordain'd thereby, and conſequently the Form muſt be fully ſufficient even in all that which you your ſelf require to make it ſo. But to this you object that thoſe later words give power only to *Diſpenſe* the Sacraments and not to Conſecrate, and therefore cannot give power to Conſecrate the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, and make preſent the Body and Blood of our Saviour (as you term it) which you look on as the main of the Prieſtly power; but only to Diſpenſe it, that is, to diſtribute the Elements when Conſecrated, which a Deacon only can do. To this I Anſwer,

1. That the word Diſpenſe, is here made uſe of as a general Term which reacheth both Word and Sacraments, and therefore cannot be limited to that particular ſenſe of diſtributing the Elements only in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt (as you will have it) but muſt comprehend whatſoever the Miniſters of Chriſt, who as his Stewards are intruſted with his Word and Sacraments, are commanded by him to do in order to the giving out and diſpenſing of both, for the Salvation of thoſe to whom they are ſent.

2. The whole Objection being concerning the ſignification of the word *Diſpenſe*, you muſt not go for that to the Cavils of Adverſaries, but to the intent and meaning of our Church in the uſe of it. For words have no otherwiſe their ſignification, than according to the appointment and acceptation of thoſe that uſe them, and muſt always expreſs that ſenſe which by common conſent and uſage is intended by them. And therefore ſince you plainly acknowledge, as doth alſo your * *Eraſtus Senior* whom you follow herein, that the Church of *England* means and intends Conſecration, as well as Diſtribution by the word *Diſpenſe*; it neceſſarily follows, that that muſt be the ſignification of it in this Form. For certainly a whole National Church intending ſuch a ſenſe by ſuch a word for an hundred and fifty years together, it is enough to make it ſignifie ſo though that were never the ſenſe of it before, becauſe words not being neceſſary, but

* Chap. 7.

but only Arbitrary ſigns of things muſt alwa,s ſo ſignifie, as is intended by the common conſent of them that uſe them.

But, 3. To come to the main ſolution of the matter, the caſe is plainly thus. Our Reformers making Scripture the Principal Rule of all their Eſtabliſhments, did in the appointing of this Form, take the very words of it from thence as near as they could, and therefore as they had the former part thereof out of the 20th. Chapter of the Goſpel of St. *John*, Verſe 22, 23. ſo had they the latter from the 4th. Chapter of the Firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* Verſe the firſt; only with this difference, that whereas the former are the very words of Scripture, the latter inſtead of the very words [*Diſpenſers of the Myſteries of God*] to make the thing more plain and clear is expreſs'd by other words equivalent thereto [*Diſpenſers of the Word of God and of his Holy Sacraments*] the Word of God and his holy Sacraments being on all hands acknowledged to be the whole of what is there intended by *the Myſteries of God*. And although the Original word Οἰκονόμοι is better rendred *Stewards*, as in our Tranſlation than Diſpenſers, yet the Gentlemen of *Rome* can have no reaſon to find fault with us, in this particular, ſince herein we follow their own Bible the vulgar Latin which their Council of *Trent* hath decreed to be the only Authentic Scripture. For at the firſt Reformation of our Church, the Original Languages of the Holy Scriptures being but little known, the Vulgar Latin Verſion was that which was then generally uſed among us, and therefore the expreſſion is put in our Form according as it was found in that Verſion, for there it is *Diſpenſatores Myſteriorum Dei*, and accordingly the *Rhemiſts* tranſlate it; *The Diſpenſers of the Miſteries of God*, and therefore the whole Controverſie between us muſt be brought to this point only, whether *Diſpenſers of the Myſteries of God* in that place doth ſignifie Prieſts or no? and if it doth, it muſt neceſſarily follow, that it ſignifies the ſame alſo in our Form of Ordination where it is uſed: And I doubt not if you will be pleaſed to look upon that Text of Scripture even as tranſlated by our Adverſaries themſelves, it will not be poſſible for you to perſwade your ſelf that when the Holy Apoſtle St. *Paul* there ſays of himſelf and the other Apoſtles, * *So let a man eſteem us as the Miniſters of Chriſt and the Diſpenſers of the Myſteries of God*, he means it only as Deacons. No certainly, both thoſe phraſes, *Miniſters of Chriſt*, and *Diſpenſers of the Myſteries of God* are equivalent Expreſſions, denoting them as inveſted with the whole Miniſtry of the Goſpel committed to them. And if you will commit the deciſion of this Cauſe to *Eſtius*, an Eminent and Learned Doctor of the Church of *Rome*, he will plainly tell you ſo, for on that Text of Scripture he ſo explains thoſe phraſes: And on the 7th. verſe of the firſt of *Titus*, he interprets *Diſpenſatorem Dei*, i. e. *the Diſpenſer of God*, to be *Dei Vicarium ac Miniſtrum in Diſpenſatione Evangelii & Sacramentorum*, i. e. *Gods Vicar and Miniſter in the*

* *Rhemiſh Teſtament*, 1 Cor. 4. v. 1.

the Diſpenſing of his Goſpel and Sacraments; and then immediately after he repeats the forementioned Text, 1 *Cor.* 4. 1. denoting, *Diſpenſers of the Myſteries of God* in that place, and *Diſpenſer of God* here, to be both underſtood in the ſame ſenſe. And therefore according to him, who was as Eminent a Doctor of their Church as any they have to boaſt of, *Diſpenſers of the Myſteries of God*, and *Diſpenſers of the Goſpel* (or Word of God) *and the Sacraments*, were the Miniſters of God, or the Vicar of God; that is, ſuch as in his ſtead did Adminiſter to his People his Word and Sacraments; which are Titles that never uſed to be given to any under the Degree of a Prieſt. And if you will go unto the School-men, and other Writers of the Church of *Rome*, nothing is more common among them than by Diſpenſers of the Sacraments to mean the Prieſts of the Church of Chriſt; and by the Act of Diſpenſing of them, the peculiar Duty in which they Officiate: And if there were any need of it Thouſands of Inſtances may be given hereof.

IV. But after all their Cavils againſt our Form of Prieſtly Ordination, as if it were not ſufficient to confer the whole Prieſtly power, they muſt themſelves in their Ordinations of Prieſts confer this power by the ſame Form which we alſo uſe (their ſecond Form above mention'd) or not confer it at all according to their own Doctrines in this particular.

For firſt they allow no Form to do any thing of this, but what is an eſſential Form, but from ſome of their own poſitions it muſt neceſſarily follow that the firſt Form cannot be an eſſential Form, and therefore it muſt follow that the laſt Form only can be ſuch in their Ordinations of Prieſts, and conſequently that by that only as the alone Eſſential Form the whole Prieſtly power muſt be given in their Ordinations of Prieſts, or elſe it muſt not be given at all, they having no other Form beſides theſe two which they ever ſay to be eſſential to that Sacrament (as they call it). Now that the firſt Form cannot be an eſſential Form, according to their own poſitions, I prove by theſe following Arguments.

1. That cannot be an Eſſential Form which is joyned with a Matter which is not Eſſential; but the Matter with which the firſt Form is joyned [*the delivery of the Chalice and Patten to the Perſon Ordained*] cannot be an Eſſential matter, and therefore the Form of words joyned therewith cannot be an Eſſential Form. The firſt propoſition is that which none of the Gentlemen you converſe ſo much with will deny, becauſe they well know that the Matter as well as the Form both concurring to the making up of the Eſſence of things, the Form cannot be Eſſential to the Conſtituting of any thing, where the Matter is not Eſſential alſo. And therefore all I ſuppoſe will be requir'd of me to make this Argument out, will be to prove the ſecond Propoſition; that the delivery of the Chalice and Patten in their Ordination of Prieſts cannot be an Eſſential Matter, and this I ſay muſt neceſſarily follow from their own poſitions. And that firſt becauſe abundance of the moſt Learned of

them

them, as *Morinus*, *Habertus*, *Hallier* and ſeveral others, do plainly grant that this Rite was never uſed in the Church for near a thouſand years after Chriſt, and therefore it is impoſſible that it can be eſſential to Prieſtly Ordination, unleſs you will allow that the Order of Prieſthood could for ſo many years together be conferr'd without that which is eſſential thereto, or elſe that all the Ordinations of Prieſts for all that time were null and void for want of it, neither of which I ſuppoſe any of our Adverſaries will ever ſay.

2. I alſo ſay that this muſt neceſſarily follow from their own poſitions, becauſe they allow the Prieſtly Ordinations of the *Greek* Church to be good and valid, which are adminiſtred without it. For they Ordain by Impoſition of hands only, without ever uſing the other Rite of delivering the Chalice and Patten at all, in their Ordinations, and yet the Church of *Rome* is ſo far from diſallowing their Orders ſo conferr'd, that they do not only allow them to be good and valid, but alſo permit thoſe *Greek* Biſhops which have come over to their Communion, and have Churches maintain'd for them in *Rome* it ſelf, and by the *Pope*'s own Charge, ſtill to Ordain after the ſame manner, and by Impoſition of hands only, and Cardinal *Lugo* * tells us that he himſelf ſaw Ordinations thus performed at *Rome* by *Greek* Biſhops. And therefore if this Ordination be thus allowed by them as compleat in its whole Eſſence which is thus adminiſtred without the delivery of the Chalice and Patten, it muſt neceſſarily follow that according to this Conceſſion, this Rite which is the firſt Matter in the *Roman* Ordinations of Prieſts cannot be Eſſential to that Adminiſtration.

* *De Sacramentis Diſp. 2. Sect. 5. n. 85.*

Which two Arguments are ſo prevalent with the Learnedeſt and beſt of that Communion, that abundance of them in direct Terms aſſert Impoſition of Hands to be the only Eſſential Matter whereby the Order of Prieſthood is conferr'd. (*a*) *Morinus* directly ſays it in oppoſition to the other Matter, the delivery of the Chalice and Patten, which he excludes from being an Eſſential Matter for the ſame two Reaſons I have laid down, which he ſays are plain Demonſtrations againſt it. *Bonaventure*, *Petrus Sotus*, and *Becanus* the Jeſuit who alſo deny this Matter to be Eſſential, I have already made mention of. (*b*) *Hallier* the Learned Sorboniſt I have afore cited, is very large to prove that Impoſition of Hands could only be the Eſſential Matter of Prieſtly Ordination for the firſt 800 years after Chriſt, and at length concludes his Diſcourſe concerning it with theſe words; (*c*) *Diuturno tempore tam in Orientali quam in Occidentali Eccleſia retentum ut Hierarchici Ordines Epiſcoporum, ſcilicet Presbyterorum & Diaconorum ſola manuum impoſitione conferrentur.* i. e. *It was a long while retained both in the*

(*a*) *Part. 3. Exercit. 7. c. 1.*

(*b*) *De Sacr's Electionibus & Ordinationibus* Part 2. Sect. 2. chap. 2. Art 1. 2.

(*c*) *Ib.* Art. 5.

the Eaſtern and Weſtern Church that the Hierarchical Orders, that is, the Orders of Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons ſhould be conferr'd by Impoſition of Hands only. And as low down as the year 1536. a Council then held at *Cologne* ſpeaks of Impoſition of Hands as the only Rite whereby Orders are adminiſtred, the words of the Council are, (*d*) *Impoſitionem manuum eſſe oſtium per quod intrant qui Eccleſiarum gubernaculis admoventur*, i. e. *That Impoſition of Hands is the door whereby thoſe enter that are appointed to have the Government of Churches*; and if it be the door whereby men enter into the Orders of the Church it is plain enough it muſt be the only Rite whereby they are admitted into them, for by the door only is it that men are admitted into the houſe. And thirteen years after another Council held at *Mentz*, ſays as fully to the ſame purpoſe. (*e*) *Collationem ordinum cum Impoſitione manuum velut viſibili ſigno tradi. i. e. That the Collation of Orders is delivered by Impoſition of Hands as the viſible ſign. By which words* (*f*) ſaith *Vaſquez*, *ſeems to be denoted that the viſible ſign in which this Sacrament doth conſiſt, and by vertue of which the Power and the Grace is conferr'd, is in Impoſition of Hands.* But *Arcudius* is moſt expreſs in this matter; For, ſaith he, (*g*) *Si nolumus negare Sacramentum Ordinis in Eccleſiâ Latinâ, neceſſe eſt pro materiâ hujus Sacramenti ſolam impoſitionem manuum aſſignare, hanc enim ſolam Apoſtoli, Concilia, & Antiqui Patres commemorant*; i. e. *If we will not deny the Sacrament of Orders in the Latin Church, it is neceſſary that we aſſign only Impoſition of Hands for the matter of this Sacrament, for that only the Apoſtles and Councils and ancient Fathers make mention of.* And therefore he ſaith in (*h*) another place, that not only the power of Juriſdiction, but alſo the power of Order is conferr'd by Impoſition of Hands, that is, not only the power of Abſolving Penitents, but alſo the power of Conſecrating and Adminiſtring the Euchariſt; and he ſaith, that the Councils and Fathers whenſoever they ſpeak of the Order of Prieſthood to be given by Impoſition of Hands, mean all this power to be conferr'd thereby, and for proof hereof he quotes a certain Comment that goes under the name of St. *Ambroſe*, which on the 4th. Chapter of the firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* hath theſe words, *Manuum Impoſitionis verba ſunt Myſtica, quibus confirmatur ad opus Electus accipiens autoritatem teſte Conſcientiâ ut audeat vice Domini Sacrificia Deo offerre*; i. e. *The words of Impoſition of Hands are Myſtical, by which the Elected is confirmed to the work of the Miniſtry receiving Authority, his Conſcience bearing him witneſs, that he may make bold in the ſtead of our Lord to offer Sacrifice unto God.* And from thence he remarkes, *quod manuum Impoſitio inſerviat poteſtati accipiendæ in verum corpus Chriſti*, i. e. *That Impoſition of Hands doth*

(*d*) *Concil Cologr. ſub Hermanno Archiepiſcopo*, cap. 1.

(*e*) *Concil. Mogun. ſub Sebaſtiano Archiepiſcopo*, cap. 25.

(*f*) *In Tertiam Toomæ*, Diſp. 239. nu. 42.

(*g*) *De Sacramento Ordinis.* cap. 7. pag. 525.

(*h*) *De Sacramento Ordinis.* cap. 4. pag. 510.

ſerve

ſerve to the receiving of power over the true Body of Chriſt, that is, to Conſecrate and adminiſter the Euchariſt where they will have the true body of Chriſt to be preſent. And therefore if the Authority of this Doctor of the Romiſh Church ſignifies any thing with you (who was (*b*) a perſon of that eminent note among them for his learning that he was deſigned to have been a Cardinal by *Gregory* the 15th. Had that Pope lived to have made another promotion) this laſt matter of Impoſition of hands with the form of words annex'd muſt give not only the power to abſolve penitents, but alſo the power of conſecrating the Euchariſt, and if they give this to them ſince they are both ſtill retain'd in our Ordinal they muſt give it us alſo, and conſequently your whole Objection againſt our Orders, as if this power were not conferr'd on us at our Ordinations, be totally remov'd. But here then you will perchance ask the Queſtion if the later Matter and Form in the *Roman* Ordinal give the whole Prieſtly power, to what end then ſerves the former Matter and Form which they make uſe of? To this I Anſwer, to the ſame purpoſe that ſome other Matters and Forms do in their Ordinal which they allow only to be accidental, that is for the more ſolemnity of the Adminiſtration, and not at all to confer the Sacerdotal power, and as ſuch no doubt at this time their firſt Matter and Form which they call eſſential would only have been reputed by all learned men among them, but that it had unwarily been declared otherwiſe in the Council of *Florence*; and therefore they being obliged to abide by that determination have been forced to frame the Scheme of their Divinity ſo in this particular, as the practice of their own Church for near a thouſand years together; the practice of all other Churches in the World down to this time, the Writings of the Ancients, many of their own Doctrines, and all Reaſon too, (which ſome of them cannot conceal) do manifeſtly contradict.

(*b*) *See* Habertus *on the* Greek *Pontifical ad* Parc. 8. Obſervat. 9. pag. 142.

2. The firſt Form cannot be an eſſential Form according to their own poſitions, becauſe according to them that only can be an Eſſential Form of any of their Sacraments which conduceth to conferre the Sacramental grace. But the Sacramental grace of the Sacrament of Orders (as they call it) cannot be confer'd by the firſt form, and therefore that can by no meanes according to their own poſitions be an Eſſential Form. For the Sacramental grace even according to their own Divinity can only be annexed to ſuch Sacramental ſigns as Chriſt himſelf the author and inſtitutor of all Sacraments hath appointed, now if it can no way be made out that Chriſt ever appointed the Rite of delivering the Chalice and Patten to be a Sacramental ſign in the Ordination of the Miniſters of his Church, then certainly no grace can ever be annex'd thereto, or the Form of words (the firſt form above mention'd) made uſe of at the adminiſtring this Rite in Ordinations ever conferre any. The Conſequence I ſuppoſe no one will ever deny, becauſe no ſigne with any

any Form of words whatever can in the leaſt conduce to the conferring of Grace, but what the Inſtitution of our Saviour hath made Sacramentall. And therefore the whole ſtreſs of the Argument lyes upon this only, that our Saviour never inſtituted this ſigne or Rite of delivering the Chalice and Patten in Ordinations or ever commanded his Holy Apoſtles, either by himſelf, while here on Earth or by the Dictates of his Holy Spirit afterwards to make uſe thereof. And there are but two ways poſſible whereby our Adverſaryes can ever pretend to make it out that he did. The Firſt is by Scripture and the other by Tradition. For they will have the Inſtitutions of our Saviour to be tranſmitted down unto us, not only by the written word, the Holy Scriptures, but alſo by the unwritten (as they call it) the Traditions of the Church, both which they will have of equal Authority for the making out of what they will have to be of divine Inſtitution. But neither of theſe will ſerve their turn in this particular, Not Tradition, Firſt becauſe no other Church bears record with them herein, and Secondly becauſe it appears by undeniable authority, and by the conceſſion of abundance of their own Doctors, as I have above mention'd, that for near a thouſand years, together after Chriſt there was not even in their own Church any Tradition at all of this matter, or the thing ever heard of among them till inſtituted by themſelves about 700 years ſince. And as to the Scripture they themſelves there give up the Cauſe plainly acknowledging that no proof at all of this matter can be had from thence. And therefore (*a*) *Bellarmine*, and (*b*) *Hallier*, and ſeveral others of them ſay, that if Impoſition of Hands be not the Eſſential Matter of Orders they can have no Argument at all out of Scripture to prove againſt the Hereticks (as they call us of the Proteſtant Religion) that it is a Sacrament. And the words of *Habertus* are (*c*) *Scriptura Ordinatio aut nihil eſt, aut manuum Impoſitio. i. e.* The Ordination of Scriptureis either nothing or impoſition of Hands. *Becanus* the Jeſuit goes further and ſay's (*d*) *Nec in Scripturis nec in antiquis Patribus, & Conciliis ſit ulla mentio porrectionis Inſtrumentorum, ſed tantum Impoſitionis manuum*; *i. e.* Neither in the Scriptures nor in the Ancient Fathers and Councils is there made any mention of the reaching out of the Veſſels (the Chalice and Patten) but of Impoſition of Hands only. And in Truth all what they ſay either from Scripture, Ancient Councils or Fathers for their Sacrament of Orders, makes Impoſition of Hands the only Sacramental Sign thereof. And all the Arguments which they bring from either of them to prove it to be a Sacrament go totally upon this, that this Rite of Impoſition of Hands made uſe of in the conferring of the Orders, hath Grace annexed thereto, and therefore it manifeſtly appearing that none of thoſe ways which our Adverſaries themſelves make uſe of to prove a

(*a*) *De Sacramento Ordinis. cap. 9.*
(*b*) *Part. 2. Sect. 2. cap. 2. Art. 1.*
(*c*) *in Pontifical. Græc. pag. 121.*
(*d*) *De Sacramento Ordinis. c. 4. n. 6.*

Divine Inſtitution are able to make it out unto us that the delivery of the Chalice and Patten in Ordination is ſuch, the Conſequence is plain that that Rite can never be a Sacramental Sign which hath Grace annex'd thereto, and conſequently the Sacramental Grace which they will have to belong to Orders cannot be given by that Rite with what Form of words ſoever it be adminiſtred; but if there be any ſuch thing at all belonging to Orders as that grace which is requiſite to make it a Sacrament (as our Adverſaries ſay and wə deny) it muſt only be annex'd to Impoſition of Hands, and given by no other words than that Form with which it is joyned, [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins,* &c.] and this even their own Council of *Trent* ſeems plainly to ſay, for in one of its Canons it Decrees

(a) *Seſs. 23. can. 3.* (a) *Si quis dixerit per Sacram Ordinationem non dari Spiritum Sanctum ac proinde fruſtra Epiſcopos dicere Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, anathema ſit*; i. e. *If any one ſhall ſay that the Holy Ghoſt is not given by Holy Orders, and therefore that the Biſhop ſayes in vain* [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*] *let him be accurſed.* Which words manifeſtly annex the grace which they will have given by this their Sacrament to the latter Form only. And ſo *Bannes* an Eminent Writer of their own Church

(b) *De Sacramento Ordinis.* cap. 9. underſtands them. For ſaith he, (b) *Ibi Concilium declarat tunc Ordinari Presbyteros, & tunc dari illis Spiritum Sanctum cum iis dicitur* [*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, &c.*] *i. e. The Council there declares that then the Prieſts are ordain'd and then the Holy Ghoſt is given unto them, when it is ſaid unto them, Receive the Holy Ghoſt.*

3. The firſt Form cannot be an Eſſential Form according to their own Poſitions, becauſe from them it muſt neceſſarily follow that that Form can only be Eſſential by which the Character is given; but the Character of Prieſthood cannot be given by the firſt Form. For ſays *Vaſquez,*

(c) *In Tert. Thom. Diſput. 239. n. 19.* (c) *Gratia collata ex virtute Sacramenti & character ſimul dantur ut omnibus in confeſſo eſt*; i. e. *The grace which is conferr'd by vertue of the Sacrament, and the Character are given together as is acknowledged by all.* And therefore if the Sacramental Grace, which they will have conferr'd at their Ordinations of Prieſts, cannot according to their own Doctrines be given by the firſt Form in their Ordinal, (as I have already made it appear that it cannot) neither can the Character of Prieſthood be given by it. Beſides, the Cha-

(d) *Concil. Trident. Seſſion. 7. De Sacramentis in genere, can. 9.* racter as they define it, being (d) a Spiritual Sign imprinted on the Soul, and of it ſelf indiviſible, it cannot be given by halves; one part of it by the firſt Matter and Form, and the other part of it by the ſecond Matter and Form, but muſt be imprinted all at once; and therefore if they will have two Eſſential Matters, and two Eſſential Forms joyned to them in the Ordination of Prieſts, they muſt

muſt alſo allow two characters to be imprinted by them on the perſons Ordain'd, (as (a) *Ferdinando De Caſtro Palao* for this reaſon doth) or elſe if they will allow but one Character only to that Order, (as is the current Doctrine of their Church) they muſt alſo allow but one Eſſential Matter and Form whereby it is to be imprinted: And if the Queſtion be of the two Matters, which of them muſt be that, whereby this is done, whether Impoſition of Hands which was firſt practiced by the Apoſtles themſelves, and hath ever ſince been uſed in all the Chriſtian Churches in the World, through all Ages, and in all Places, as every one knows; or elſe that other Rite, the delivery of the Chalice and Patten, which was never heard of in any Church for near a thouſand years after Chriſt, and at preſent is made uſe of only in the *Roman*, I hope it will be no difficult matter for you to conclude, that it can be no other but Impoſition of Hands, and therefore if that be the only Matter whereby the Character is imprinted, certainly that Form of words which is joyned with that Matter [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins*, &c.] muſt be the only Form which concurs to the giving thereof, and therefore according to what they themſelves require to make a Form Eſſential, that only can be the Eſſential Form of Prieſtly Ordination, and the other cannot at all be Eſſential thereto.

(a) *De Sacramento Ordinis punct.* 5.

Thus far therefore having made out that according to what they require to make a Form Eſſential, the firſt Form in their Ordinal of Prieſtly Ordination cannot be ſuch; and ſince they allow no other beſides this but the ſecond Form to be an Eſſential Form in that Adminiſtration, it muſt neceſſarily follow that if they will have the Form of their Prieſtly Ordination to be Eſſential, and that the Prieſtly power cannot be conferr'd but by an Eſſential Form, this ſecond Form only [*Receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins* &c.] the ſame which we uſe in our Ordinal, muſt only be that Eſſential Form whereby this is done, and therefore notwithſtanding all their Cavils againſt us, as if we did not give the whole Prieſtly power by this Form in our Ordinations, they muſt themſelves in their Ordinations give it by the very ſame Form that we do or elſe not give it at all, and ſo their Argument retort on themſelves, and invalidate their own Orders as well as ours.

But 2dly. The ſame Conſequence will alſo follow though we allow both their Forms to be eſſential as they will have, that is, that notwithſtanding the firſt Form as well as the ſecond be allowed according to them to be Eſſential, yet it muſt be ſtill the ſecond Form, the ſame which we uſe in our Ordinations, that muſt confer the whole Prieſtly power in their Ordinations alſo, or elſe it muſt not be conferr'd at all. For if the firſt Form in their Ordinal confers nothing of the Prieſtly power, it muſt be the ſecond alone that confers it, or elſe it muſt not be conferr'd at all among them. Now that the firſt Form confers nothing of the Prieſtly power, I prove by your own way of arguing,

arguing againſt our Form. That Form which expreſſeth nothing of the Prieſtly power can confer nothing of the Prieſtly power in Ordination, but the firſt Form expreſſeth nothing of the Prieſtly power, for all that it expreſſeth is only an imaginary power of their own invention, the power of offering their Sacrifice of the Maſs, and applying the merits of it to the living and the dead, a power which Chriſt never inſtituted or can be warranted by any ancient practice, but is contrary to the whole tenor of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and is in as plain Terms as can be expreſſed by ſeveral paſſages therein directly contradicted. But to this perchance you will reply that the firſt Form doth not only give power to offer the Sacrifice of the Maſs, but alſo to Celebrate Maſs for the Living and the Dead, and that by this laſt expreſſion is implyed the performance of the whole Office, and conſequently that the whole power of Conſecrating and Adminiſtring the Euchariſt is included therein. But againſt that there is this Objection, theſe words *for the Living and the Dead*, ſeem to limit the expreſſion to ſo much only of the Maſs as is Celebrated *for the living and the dead*; that is, the applying of the merits of the Sacrifice, which they pretend to offer at their Maſs, *to the living and the dead*, which is a power as totally fictitious as the former. And their Council of *Florence*, which declared this Form to be an Eſſential Form of Prieſtly Ordination ſeems plainly to underſtand it in this ſenſe. For it expreſſeth not the whole Form as it is in the *Roman* Ordinal, but the ſum of it in theſe words, *Accipe poteſtatem offerendi Sacrificium in Eccleſiâ pro vivis & defunctis*; i. e. *Receive power to offer Sacrifice in the Church for the living and the dead.* Which plainly interprets the latter Expreſſion in their Ordinal of Celebrating Maſs for the Living and the Dead, to belong to the former, and to extend no farther than the offering their pretended Sacrifice for them, which can by no means include the Conſecrating of the Euchariſt, becauſe moſt of them hold the Act of Conſecrating to be different from the Act of Sacrificing, and therefore it cannot be included in it, for they will have the Act of Conſecrating to be precedent to that of Sacrificing, becauſe ſay they the Body and Bloud of Chriſt cannot be offered up in Sacrifice, till by the words of Conſecration the Bread and Wine is converted thereinto. But notwithſtanding if they will needs have the power of Conſecrating contained in theſe words, I ſhall not lay ſuch ſtreſs upon this matter, as to make any great conteſt about it. Only this which hath already been ſaid, may be ſufficient to let you ſee, that if the power of Conſecrating the Sacrament of the Euchariſt cannot be contain'd under the words of our Form which give power *to diſpenſe the Sacraments* as our Church intends, it is much more difficult to reconcile it, how this power can be contain'd in thoſe words of their Form, whereby they intend to give it, theirs being much further from making any expreſs mention of this power of Conſecrating the Euchariſt than poſſibly it can be ſaid of ours. But be it

as

as to this how you will have it, ſtill your Objection remains as ſtrong againſt their Forms as againſt ours. For ſay you our Form is not ſufficient validly to confer the Order of Prieſthood, becauſe it doth not expreſly give the whole Prieſtly power. But by which of theirs I beſeech you is it all expreſly given? Not by the firſt Form, for therein they pretend not to expreſs any more than the Celebrating the Maſs; not by the ſecond, for in that they violently contend againſt us, nothing elſe can be expreſſed but the power of Abſolving penitents. So then if this be all their Forms expreſs, as they themſelves acknowledge, where do they give the power of Adminiſtring the Sacrament of Baptiſm? where the power of Preaching the Word? and if Marriage and extream Unction be Sacraments (as they will have them) to be Adminiſtred by the Prieſt, where do they give the power of Adminiſtring them? no where at all, they being neither expreſs'd in particular, nor comprehended in general in any of the words of the ſaid Forms. And therefore if the not expreſſing the whole Prieſtly power in the Forms of Ordination, muſt null and invalidate the Orders conferr'd thereby, let any of them anſwer how their Orders of Prieſthood can be good and valid which are Adminiſtred by Forms ſo defective herein. How we come off of this Objection I have already ſhown, and hope have ſufficiently convinced you that it cannot lye againſt us; but how they can clear themſelves of it that make it, I can ſee only two ways poſſible.

1. That they ſay the whole Prieſtly power is given by thoſe principal Branches of it expreſs'd in their Forms, with which their Prieſts being in expreſs word Inveſted at their Ordinations, they do therewith receive all the reſt as inſeparably annex'd thereto by the Inſtitution of our Saviour; in the ſame manner as when in taking Livery of Seiſin of an Eſtate, the giving any part thereof inveſts with the whole Fee. Or elſe,

2. That they come over alſo to the true Interpretation of the ſecond Form, and acknowledge with us that in that alone the whole Prieſtly power is comprehended in the ſame manner as I have above explain'd unto you. If they ſay the firſt, this Objection is very impertinently rais'd againſt us, ſince they cannot but acknowledge ſome branches of the Prieſtly power are alſo expreſs'd in our Form according to their own interpretation of it, which may ſerve for this purpoſe as well as thoſe expreſs'd in theirs. If they ſay the ſecond, then they muſt give the whole Prieſtly power by the ſame Form that we do, and therefore whatever is ſaid againſt our manner of Ordaining Prieſts from the inſufficiency of the Form of that Ordination, if it conduceth any thing to the nulling and invalidating of the Orders conferr'd among us, it muſt as much conduce to null and invalidate theirs alſo.

And now Sir, I hope I have ſaid ſufficient to give you full ſatisfaction, that our Form of Prieſtly Ordination can have no ſuch defect therein as you charge it with, or our Orders be liable to the leaſt ſuſpition of nullity on this

this account. I have not ſpared my pains to make this out as clear to you as I can, and all now that I deſire of you is impartially to conſider what hath been ſaid, and where you find reaſon, to hearken to it; and if you do ſo, I doubt not you may find ſufficient to convince you in theſe Papers I ſend you. But if you are ſo obſtinately ſet upon this point, that nothing ſhall have any force with you, which is ſaid on this ſubject, (as from what I am told of your daily Diſcourſe concerning it, I have abundant reaſon to fear) but that right or wrong you are reſolved to condemn all the Orders of our Church as null and void, I have only this further Requeſt to make unto you, that before you abſolutely renounce our Communion on this account to go over to the Church of *Rome*, you would be pleaſed well to conſider theſe three particulars.

Firſt, Whether on your going over to the Church of *Rome*, you can be ſure to find valid Orders there.

Secondly, Whether on ſuppoſition that you can you will any way better your ſelf by them. And,

Thirdly, That ſuppoſing you do yet whether on other accounts it may not ſtill be beſt for you to remain where you are.

And Firſt, Before you go over from us to the Church of *Rome*, becauſe you think our Orders not valid, I deſire you would conſider whether you can be ſure to find valid Orders there. For if you do not, you will loſe the whole reaſon of your Change, and be at the ſame loſs among them that you at preſent pretend to be at among us, But how you who are ſo ſcrupulous at our Orders can ever be ſatisfied with theirs, if you act with any Sincerity in this Matter, I cannot ſee poſſible. For there are none of thoſe Objections which they raiſe againſt our Orders for the nulling of them, but may I aſſure you be urged with much more ſtrength and reaſon againſt theirs. If they urge againſt us the want of due Succeſſion, the many Schiſmes, Diſturbances, and undue Elections of Popes which they have had afford us many inſtances to make it out againſt them with much more reaſon than they can object it unto us. If they urge the defect of the Forms, I have already ſhown you how all this Objection retorts upon themſelves. If they urge the Breach of Eccleſiaſtical Canons about Elections and Ordinations, none have more broken them than themſelves, of which I have given you ſome few Inſtances, and abundance of others might be added unto them. If they urge the want of the Popes Confirmation at the Conſecrating of our Biſhops, how many ages of the Church were there in which their own Biſhops, excepting only thoſe of the Popes own Metropolitical Juriſdiction, were always Conſecrated without it? If they urge Hereſie

or

or Schiſme, have not ſome of their own Popes, as they themſelves acknowledge, been guilty hereof? And if *Simony* be Hereſie, as is generally held in that Church, how few of them can be ſaid to be free from it, ſince moſt of them aſcend the Papal Throne by buying the Votes of their Electors, and to make themſelves amends ſell all the Eccleſiaſtical Benefices they diſpoſe of afterwards, as is too notoriouſly known to be denyed. But waving theſe particulars that I may not be too long I ſhall inſiſt only on one thing they hold, which doth not only make it uncertain unto all men whether Orders are validly conferr'd on any that are Ordain'd in that Church, but even morally impoſſible that there ſhould be now any at all among them, that is their Doctrin of the Intention, which is that none of their Sacraments can be validly adminiſtred to any when there doth not concur with the Act of adminiſtration the intention of him that adminiſters them of doeing thereby what the Church doth. And this Doctrin whenever you go over to the Church of Rome you muſt receive as an infallible truth, and if it be ſo then muſt neceſſarily follow what I ſay.

Firſt that it muſt be alwayes uncertain in that Church whether Orders (which they hold a Sacrament) are validly conferr'd on any that are there Ordained or no, becauſe how validly ſoever they may be adminiſtered as to matter and form and all other things requir'd, which the Spectators may be certain witneſſes of, yet the intention of the ordainer being that of which no man can be certain, it is impoſſible the wiſeſt and moſt diligent inquirer can ever be certain whether any Prieſt under whoſe conduct he ſhall put himſelf be validly Ordain'd a Prieſt or no. And therefore when you go over to the Church of Rome for the ſake of more valid Orders, then you think we have, after your beſt inquiry it may be your lot to light always on ſuch Prieſts from whoſe hands to receive the benefits of the Prieſtly Miniſtration, as for want of the intention of the Ordainer were never truely Ordain'd Prieſts at all, and conſequently be at no better paſs among them, then now you think you are among us. But this is not the worſt of that which follows from hence. For,

Secondly, If the intention of him that adminiſters the Sacraments be alwayes neceſſary to make the adminiſtration good and valid, and conſequently that orders (which they hold a Sacrament) cannot be validly conferr'd on any without the intention of the Ordainer concurring at the act of Ordination, this will make it not only uncertain who are true Prieſts among them and who not, but alſo morally ſpeaking render it utterly impoſſible that they ſhould at preſent have any at all among them validly ordained to that Office. For the caſe is plainly thus, They all hold Baptiſme to be abſolutely neceſſary to the Prieſthood, and the Prieſthood to be abſolutely neceſſary to the Order of Epiſcopacy, ſo that a man cannot be validly Ordain'd a Prieſt

unleſs he be firſt validly Baptiſed, or validly Ordain'd a Biſhop, unleſs he be firſt validly made a Prieſt, and that neither of theſe can validly be done unleſs there be in him that performes that adminiſtration a right intention of doing thereby what the Church doth. So then to make a man a true Prieſt among them there muſt be, Firſt the right intention of him that Baptiſed him to make him capable of the Prieſthood, and Secondly the right intention of the Biſhop that Ordain'd him validly to conferre the Office upon him. And then to impower the Biſhop validly to Ordain he muſt be Baptiſed with right intention, Ordained Prieſt with a right intention, and laſtly be Ordain'd Biſhop with a right intention; and then again he that Ordained him Prieſt muſt be Baptiſed with a right intention, Ordain'd Prieſt with a right intention, and Ordain'd Biſhop with a right intention, and the ſame muſt be ſayd of him that Ordain'd him Biſhop, and ſo up through all the deſcents that have hapned in the tranſmiſſion of the Prieſtly power from the time of our Saviour down to us, which through ſo long a ſucceſſion of near 1700 years muſt make all the Acts of right intentions in the adminiſtering of Baptiſme and in the adminiſtering of Orders, which according to the Roman Doctrin are neceſſary to make their Orders at preſent good and valid, to amount to the number of many hundred thouſands, and if of all theſe any one hath fail'd from the beginning that one alone breaks the whole chain of ſucceſſion aſunder, and all that comes after is made null and voyd thereby. And that in ſo vaſt a number there ſhould not be ſuch a failure yea and many of them too is that which morally ſpeaking I ſay is utterly impoſſible. For how many have been made Prieſts and Biſhops among them who in the adminiſtering of the Sacraments have never intended at all to do thereby what the Church doth, but at the ſame time they have performed the outward, Acts have inwardly in their hearts out of malice, wickedneſs or infidelity totally diſregarded and contemn'd all that is meant or intended by them. For have not many of them according to their own writers been Atheiſts, many of them ſorcerers and Magicians and many of ſuch profligate lives and converſations as can never be ſuppoſed to have intended any thing at all of Religion in any of the Acts of their function which they have performed, but being either by the road of their education or the deſire of inriching themſelves by Church preferments got into thoſe holy Offices have gone on in the common tract to do as others did for the ſake of the gain while at the ſame time in their minds they ſcoffed at and derided the whole Miniſtration. And how many even of their Popes according to their own Hiſtorians have been ſuch, whom they make the fountains from which under Chriſt all Prieſtly and Eccleſiaſtical power is derived, and if any impartial man will read their Lives, I doubt not to ſay he will certainly conclude the better half of them to be of this ſort. And to add one conſideration more, how many ſince the Rigor of the Inquiſition hath been

been ſet up in *Portugal*, *Spain* and *Italy*, that have been *Jews* in reality, have for fear of the barbarous Tyranny of that Tribunal ſo far diſſembled their Religion as the better to cloke it from diſcovery, have taken upon them not only the outward profeſſion of Chriſtianity but the Orders of the Church alſo, and have become Prieſts and Biſhops therein, as it is well known there have been ſeveral Inſtances of it in thoſe Countries? And can you think that any of them could either in the giving of Orders or Adminiſtring of Baptiſme, ever have any intention of doing thereby what the Church doth? No, they ever are the greateſt Enemies of our Religion and all the Inſtitutions of it, and always Curſe and abhor them whenever under this Mask they Miniſter in any of them. And on all theſe accounts it cannot be poſſible but that through ſo long a time as near 1700 years there muſt be in every chain of Succceſſion whereby the Orders of that Church are ſaid to be derived down to the preſent times many failures of this kind, whereby totally to cut them off from all that follow after. And therefore if this Doctrine of the intention of him that Miniſters the Sacraments among them be true, as it is held in that Church infallibly to be, and to which as an infallible Truth you muſt give up your Faith whenever you liſt your ſelf among them, it muſt from hence follow that it cannot be poſſible that they can at this time have any Orders at all among them.

But Secondly, Suppoſing their Orders be good, yet before you go over to them on this Account, I deſire you in the next place to conſider whether you can at all better your ſelf by ſo doing. For what benefit of their Miniſtry is it, I beſeech you, that you would go over to them for? Is it firſt for the ſake of their Preaching of the Word? But do not they in that Church lock this up in a Language which you cannot underſtand? forbid Laymen to look into it that they may the better impoſe on them their Erroneous Doctrines and lead them whether they pleaſe? And do they not inſtead thereof from their Pulpits moſtly teach the Traditions of men as their Doctrines of Purgatory, Pilgrimages, Worſhipping of Croſſes, and the Images and Relicts of Saints, Maſſes for the Dead, overplus of Saints Merit, Pardons, Indulgences and ſuch like, and filling their Sermons moſtly with theſe and old Wives Tales, which they relate concerning their Saints, and the Miracles they Fabulouſly aſcribe unto them to make room for theſe Fopperies, wave the Divine Truths of the Goſpel, and turn Chriſt and his Apoſtles quite out of doors? Or is it ſecondly for the ſake of their prayers and publick Worſhip? But how can thoſe prayers do you any good with which you cannot joyn, they being all in that Church in Latin, a Language which you do not underſtand? Or how can that Worſhip render you acceptable unto God, which by reaſon of the many Superſtitions and erroneous practices with which it is performed muſt it ſelf be totally unacceptable unto him? Or

elſe is it thirdly for the ſake of the Sacraments ? But 1. As to the Sacrament of Baptiſm, the Church of *Rome* allowing it to be validly adminiſtred by Laymen, you cannot want that in our Church, and whenever you go over to them, they will allow you your Baptiſm which you receiv'd among us to be good and valid without Baptizing you again. And 2. As to the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, allowing their Prieſts to have full power to Conſecrate it, yet you can never be ſure in that Church that they do. As to the intention of doing what the Church doth, there required, you muſt ever be at a loſs, and you can be no better aſſur'd of the outward Act, becauſe the words of Conſecration are always whiſper'd in ſecret, and I have read of one that was burnt among them for Conſecrating the Euchariſt in the Name of the Devil; and as long as they do it in ſecret, an opportunity ſo proper for the deeds of Darkneſs, you can never be ſure but that this or ſome other thing like it may be done again whenever you come to receive from them. But waving theſe particulars and ſuppoſing the Conſecration to be in all things aright performed, as you would have it, yet ſince they of late have ſo miſerably defaced this Sacrament, as to deny the Cup one of the Eſſentials of it to the Laity, I cannot ſee how in that Church you that are a Layman can ever have the holy Euchariſt at all adminiſtred to you. For in all things the withdrawing of an Eſſential muſt neceſſarily cauſe a deſtruction of the whole, and therefore ſince our Saviours inſtitution makes both Elements Equally neceſſary and Eſſential to this Sacrament the withdrawing the Cup from the Laity makes it no Sacrament at all to them, and conſequently none that go over unto them on this account, becauſe they think our Prieſts have not ſufficient Authority to Conſecrate the Euchariſt (which is your grand Objection) will at all better themſelves thereby, but from a doubt of an invalidity with us fall into a certain nullity with them, and be totally depriv'd of the whole benefit of this Sacrament as long as they continue among them. For I make no difficulty at all to aſſert, but do here declare it unto you as my Opinion, and let him diſprove me that can, that ſince the Church of *Rome* hath Sacrilegiouſly taken away the Cup from the Laity, they have never Adminiſtred to them the Sacrament of the Euchariſt at all, but the want of this Eſſential hath certainly as to them made a Nullity in the whole Adminiſtration, and totally deprived them of all the benefits of it.

And here I cannot but admire the Confidence or rather Impudence of thoſe men, who are ſo forward to deny us our Orders, becauſe at the firſt Reformation of the Ordinal we altered the Forms of Ordination, which from the beginning were but of Humane Inſtitution, and of very late date too introduced among them (as I have ſhown) and yet make no ſcruple at all

all themſelves to alter from the Inſtitution of Chriſt himſelf in this Holy Sacrament of the Euchariſt, and with a * *Non obſtante* to his Divine Law cut off one half of that which he hath appointed, and by that appointment made as much Eſſential to the Sacrament as the other half they have retain'd. Had the Forms of Ordination been inſtituted and Commanded by Chriſt himſelf, as the Adminiſtring of the Cup in this Holy Sacrament was, then I confeſs to alter them or omit any part of them might infer a Nullity in the whole performance, and the Arguments which our Adverſaries bring from hence would be unanſwerable againſt us in this particular. But it being manifeſt that there is no ſuch Inſtitution for them, all what they urge from our altering of them for the Nulling of our Orders becomes totally inſignificant. But how they will be able to Anſwer the ſame Arguments when turn'd againſt themſelves to prove a Nullity in their Adminiſtration of the Euchariſt without the Cup which Chriſt certainly inſtituted and commanded as a part thereof I cannot ſee poſſible.

* *Concil. Conſtan. Seſſ.* 13.

But Thirdly, Suppoſing you might certainly receive from them all the benefits of their Miniſtry which you propoſe, yet ſince there are in that Church ſo many dangerous Errors both in Faith and Practice, all which you muſt neceſſarily joyn with them in, whenever you go over to them, whether on this account it be not ſtill beſt for you to remain as you are, is that which in the laſt place I deſire you to conſider. For can you believe that they can turn a Wafer into God, and eat him too with his Divinity when they have done? Can you believe that they can every day, and in an hundred thouſand places at once offer up Chriſt contrary to the expreſs words of Scripture, to be as proper, true and real a Sacrifice in their Maſſes, as when he died upon the Croſs for us? And that they can make Expiation thereby both for the Living and the Dead? Can you believe that Saints are made Fellow-Mediators with Chriſt, and that by the overplus of their Merit Satisfaction can be made for ſin as well as by the blood of our Redeemer? And can you believe that the Pope hath a Treaſure hereof to diſpoſe of by pardons and Indulgences? Or that Heaven can be bought with the money with which theſe are ſold? Can you believe that Church Infallible, which evidently err's in a multitude of things every day? That its Traditions are as true as Scripture? Or that a Prieſt can forgive Sins? Or that the deciſions of a Pope are as Infallible as the Oracles of God himſelf? Can you Worſhip a piece of Bread for your God? And adore Relicks, Images and Croſſes contrary to the expreſs prohibitions of the Word of God? Can you pray unto men departed, of whom you can have no certainty whether in Heaven or in Hell? Can you Worſhip the Virgin *Mary* as the Heathens did their Goddeſſes

deſſes, and fall down to every Stock or Stone that repreſents her? For all thoſe things and many more like them muſt you believe and do whenever you go over unto them.

Now the Queſtion is whether you are convinced theſe things are to be believed and done or no, if you are, this conviction makes you totally theirs whither our Orders be good or no, and the diſpute which you ſtick at concerning them is totally needleſs. But if you are not convinced concerning theſe points, as I beleive you cannot, then the whole queſtion comes to this, whether in caſe they have Orders, and we none we are for the ſake of them only bound to go over to that Church, and joyn with them in all thoſe Errors of faith and practice which they there hold. And if this be a thing which you ſtick at, for the ſolution of it I will only lay before you a plain parallel caſe under the Jewiſh Law, By that you know the Sons of *Aaron* were the only true Prieſts and none other were to ſerve at the Altar of the Lord but they only. Now put the Caſe that when the Ten Tribes revolted with *Jeroboam* to the worſhip of the Calves in *Dan* and *Bethel* all the whole houſe of *Aaron* had revolted with them, muſt the reſt of the people for the ſake of their Prieſthood have gone over to them alſo, and forſaken the true worſhip of their God for ever! No certainly, you will ſay, but that they muſt either have conſtituted other Prieſts preſuming on the divine approbation in this caſe of neceſſity, or elſe if that were not to be don rather remain without Prieſt or Altar then commit ſo great an abomination for the ſake thereof. And this is plainly the caſe before us, For Suppoſing all the whole Chriſtian Prieſthood had ſo joyned themſelves to the Corruptions of the Romiſh Sect, that we who retain the true purity of our Religion had neither Biſhops, Prieſts nor Deacons among us, as you would have, muſt we for the ſake of their Prieſthood alſo go over to them, and pollute ourſelves with them in all thoſe Errors, Superſtitions and Idolatrys which they give themſelves up unto; No certainly, if this were our caſe (as I thank God it is not) we muſt either ſeparate others to the Miniſtry of our own appointment preſuming on the divine approbation in this caſe of neceſſity, or elſe if this be not to be done; ſince duties enjoyned by poſitive inſtitution, as theſe of the Miniſtry are, may in many caſes be diſpenſed with, but that which is Sinful is in no caſe to be done, rather then do ſo Sinful and wicked a thing in the preſence of God as to joyne our ſelves to that corrupted Church and all the abominations of it, it is much better for us to remain without Prieſt, Sacrament or publick Worſhip and ſerve God with our private Devotions only, which hath been the Caſe of many a good Chriſtian, who, ſince our Trafick into the *Eaſt-Indies* hath begun, have on many occaſions been detained in Countries totally Heathen without Sacrament or publick Worſhip for many years together. And you cannot but ſay that it would be a very bad Argument

in

in this caſe to perſwade thoſe Chriſtians to put themſelves under the Conduct of the *Bramins* and *Talapoins*, the Idolatrous Prieſts of thoſe Countries, becauſe they can there have no Prieſts of their own, and I aſſure you that which is now urg'd upon you to draw you over to the Church of *Rome*, becauſe they ſay they have Prieſts and we none is very little better.

And now Sir, Having in this Paper thus fully handled the Argument you propoſed and anſwered all the Objections which you made, I leave it with you to work that effect on you which God ſhall give: And am,

January, 27th. 168$\frac{7}{8}$. *Your humble Servant*,

H. Prideaux.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

The Author being an Hundred Miles diſtance from the Preſs when the Books was Printed, the Reader is deſired to excuſe the wrong Pointing which is too frequent, and theſe following Errors in the words of the Book.

Page 2. Line 17. for *never defective*, read *never ſo defective*. p. 3. l. 13. f. *the the cavil*, r. *that cavil*, p. 5. l. 4. f. *and to the beſt* &c. r. *And to the beſt*, with a full point before *And*, and none after *remembrance*, p. 5. l. 12. f. *reſolution* r. *ſolution*, p. 8. l. 13. f. *Forme* r. *former*, p. 9. l. 29. f. *given thee the Spirit* r. *given us*, p. 16. l. 6. f. *ſeveral ſucceſſors* r. *ſeveral ſucceſſions*, p. 16. l. 39. f. *adhere to her* r. *adhered to her*, p. 19. l. 8. f. *they had power* r. *they had no power*, p. 37. l. 26. blot out *thing*, p. 39. l. 37. f. *never will ſubſiſt* r. *never well ſubſiſt*, p. 44. l. 21. f. *received* r. *reviewed*, p. 47. l. 5. blot out *an eminent Jeſuit*, p. 50. l. 37. f. *to be Ordaining* r. *to be Ordained*, p. 74. l. 4. f. *forget* r. *forgo*, p. 79. l. 29. f. *Miletias* r. *Meletius*, p. 81. l. 35. f. *Odell* r. *Odett*, p. 82. l. 2. f. *Preshyters* r. *Preshyter*, p. 82. l. 13. f. *nulla tenentes* r. *Nullatenenſes*, p. 85. l. 38. f. *matter* r. *matters*, p. 92. l. 15. f. *Aptungitum* r. *Aptungis*, p. 105. l. *ult.* blot out *and a Jeſuite*, p. 111. l. 7. f. *Vicar* r. *Vicars*.

A Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy; to which is added, A Discourse concerning the Unity of the Church. By Dr. *Isaac Barrow*.

A Discourse against Transubstantiation. By Dr. *Tillotson*.

A Discourse concerning the Adoration of the Host, as it is Taught and Practised in the Church of *Rome*.

A Discourse of the Communion in One Kind; In Answer to a Treatise of the Bishop of *Meaux's*.

A Discourse of the Sacrifice of the Mass, in 4°.

A Discourse against Purgatory.

An Answer to a Book Entituled, Reason and Authority: Or, the Motives of a late Protestant's Reconciliation to the Catholick Church. In a Letter to a Friend. Together with a Brief Account of *Austin* the Monk, and Conversion of the *English*, in 4°.

The Judgment of private Discretion in Matters of Religion Defended; in a Sermon on 1 *Thes.* v. 21. Preached at *St. Pauls Covent-Garden*, Feb. 26. 1686. By *Richard Kidder*.

A Request to *Roman* Catholicks to Answer the Queries upon these their following Tenets: 1. *Their Divine Service in an unknown Tongue.* 2. *Their taking away the Cup from the People.* 3. *Their withholding the Scriptures from the Laicks.* 4. *The Adoration of Images.* 5. *The Invocation of Saints and Angels.* 6. *The Doctrine of Merit.* 7. *Purgatory.* 8. *Their Seven Sacraments.* 9. *Their Priests Intension in Baptism.* 10. *The Limbo of Unbaptized Infants.* 11. *Transubstantiation.* 12. *The Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass.* 13. *Private Masses.* 14. *The Sacrament of Penance, &c.*

A Defence of the Ordinations and Ministry of the Church of *England*. In Answer to the Scandals raisd or revivd against them in several late Pamphlets, and particularly in one, Entituled, *The Church of* England *truly Represented*, &c. In 4°. price 9 d.